

CHRONOLOGICAL ANTIQUITIES:

OR, THE
ANTIQUITIES and CHRONOLOGY

OF THE

Most ANCIENT KINGDOMS, from the Creation of the
World, for the Space of Five thousand Years.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

In this WORK,

The Original HEBREW Chronology of the Old Testament, both before and after the Flood, is restored; and all the Difficulties of the Scripture Chronology are cleared. The CHALDÆAN, EGYPTIAN, PHOENICIAN, and CHINESE Antiquities and Chronology, are largely explained, and shewn to agree with each other, and with the History and Chronology of Scripture.

The Origin and Chronology of the GREEKS, ROMANS, and AMERICANS, are also considered; and likewise the Origin and Antiquity of *Letters*, *Hieroglyphics*, *Obelisks*, *Pyramids*, *Oracles*, and *Mysteries*, with all the Pagan Theology, are fully treated of and explained.

The Ptolemaic Canon, and other ancient Records, with all the most ancient *Years*, *Cycles*, *Æras*, and other *Epochs*, are added, and largely explained.

The principal Errors of the most learned Chronologers, both ancient and modern, are examined and amended; and all the ancient Chronology is reduced to one entire and consistent System.

To which are added, proper INDEXES.

Παρ' οἷς ἀσυνάρτητός ἐστιν ἡ τῶν χρόνων ἀναγραφὴ, παρὰ ταῖς ἑδὲ τὰ τῆς ἰσορίας ἀληθείαν διώκει. Tatian. πρὸς Ἑλλήνας.

By JOHN JACKSON,

Rector of *Rossington* in the County of *York*, Prebendary of *Wharwell* in the County of *Southampton*, and Master of *Wigston's* Hospital in *Leicester*.

V O L. I.

L O N D O N,

Printed for the AUTHOR; and sold by J. NOON, at the *White Hart* in the *Poultry*. MDCCLII.

TO THE
MOST NOBLE PRINCE
JOHN,
Duke of RUTLAND,
Knight of the Most Noble Order
of the GARTER,
AND
Lord Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of
the County of *Leicester*.

May it please your GRACE,

TO accept a Work, which, whatever is
valuable in it, is greatly due to your
GRACE, as being the Result of that Ease and
Tranquillity of Life which is owing to your
generous Benefaction to me.

I know you have the Goodness to accept it,
as being the best Testimony of a grateful Mind,
which I am able to give for the Kindnesses I

have received, and the Friendship I have been honoured with, by your GRACE.

I am very far from desiring to get a Recommendation to any Work of mine, by the Character of the Patron I dedicate it to; though that of your GRACE is such as would easily incline many to a good Opinion and Esteem of an Author, who should be favoured by You: nor am I so vain as to think it in my Power to add any Lustre to your GRACE's real Virtues and Merit, by any Encomium I am able to bestow upon them.

I should not indeed venture to mention them at all, if I did not know them by Experience; being assured of incurring your GRACE's Displeasure by the least Appearance of Flattery, which, I hope, I shall always be as averse to offer, as I believe your GRACE is to receive it.

But if I did not personally know your GRACE's generous and benevolent Temper; your most courteous Affability to all; your strict and exemplary Sobriety, and high Regard to Justice and Equity; your Study of
Knowledge

Knowledge with an impartial Love of Truth ; and especially your truly noble Zeal for the Establishment of religious and civil Liberty, which are the firmest Support of *Majesty*, and the brightest Glory of a *Crown*, and necessary to produce every thing that is excellent, great, and good ; and which are both the most valuable Right of Mankind, and the greatest Ornament and Happiness of human Nature : if I had no personal Knowledge of these your GRACE'S Virtues, I should be forced to know them from public Fame, confirmed by the Attestation of all who ever had the Honour or Happiness to know you.

Therefore in speaking of the many excellent Endowments of your Mind ; of the Integrity of your Life and Actions ; your engaging Sweetness of Temper and Courtesy of Behaviour, which are natural to your GRACE, and make even your lowest Inferiors and Dependants easy and chearful in their Access to you ; and are the genuine Effect of that true Greatness which is not in the least fullied or abated, but imprints a deeper Consciousness of it,

it, by Condescension : in speaking more especially of your acquired Knowledge of several Arts and Sciences amidst a great public Employment ; and your clear and solid Judgment in every thing to which your Thoughts are applied ; your disinterested Love of your Country, and constant Endeavours to promote the Good and Welfare of it ; and, above all, your warm Love and Zeal for the divine Cause of religious and civil Liberty ; and your Hatred of all Superstition and Bigotry, and of every Degree of Persecution and Tyranny either in Church or State : in speaking of these and other Virtues and Accomplishments, which justly render your Person amiable, and both highly honoured and beloved, what do I but join my grateful Voice and Testimony to that of the whole Nation ?

As such a Disposition and Endowments adorn and dignify a private Station, so they shine forth with stronger Lustre and more beneficent Greatness and Power, in that public Station and exalted Sphere, where your GRACE is placed in the *Great Council* of this Kingdom. A
Council

Council never equalled by the famed Senates of *Rome* or *Athens*. In this are displayed the greatest Abilities, the most honourable Sentiments expressed by a commanding and irresistible Eloquence, and a Courage made heroic by an exalted Sense of Liberty ; guided by a Policy not partial or confined, like that of *Rome* and *Sparta*, to the Interests of their own Republics ; but holding the Ballance of the *Power of all Europe*, and confining it to the Laws which God and Nature have set to it.

How mean and contemptible do the greatest Tyrants, ruling over enslaved Nations, appear, in Comparison of that Monarch, who reigns over so many *Princes* rather than *Subjects* ; and who delights to be the *Father* more than the *King* of his People ; whose Interests and Affections are so united, as to make him the divine Soul of an immortal Body ; and whose Majesty, Riches, and Power, are not those of one Man, but the united Majesty, Strength, and Treasures of a free, brave, and wealthy Nation ; which, whilst so united, can never be exhausted or subdued ?

And

And when we think on a Family, that by the Goodness of divine Providence has preserv'd our Religion and Liberties, when in the greatest Danger of being lost, we cannot but with grateful Sentiments turn our Eyes to the numerous Offspring with which God hath encreased it, to perpetuate these Blessings to the latest Posterity.

What a pleasing Prospect is it to the whole *British* Nation, to see a Prince born and growing up amongst us, endued with the amiable Temper and Disposition of the most virtuous and religious Princess his Royal Mother ; which render him capable of every good and noble Impression : and what may we not hope for from him, who is educating under the Direction and Sight of his Royal Grandfather, whose heroic Courage, mature Wisdom, and God-like Spirit of *Justice, Clemency, and Benevolence*, will be infused and implanted in his Royal Breast, to make him a Glory and Happiness to these Kingdoms, whenever it shall please God to set him over them?

But

But as the greatest and best of Kings are truly said to be honoured by the faithful Services of their greatest and best Subjects ; so the most generous and disinterested Manner, in which, for some Years, your GRACE served his present Majesty, as Chancellor of the Duchy of *Lancaster*, added Honour and Dignity to that high Office ; and was a peculiar Example of that Patriot Spirit, which excites and engages the truly great and honourable to accept of public Stations, purely, for the sake of the public Good.

All the Advantage your GRACE proposed, and which you thought more than sufficient, was the noble Satisfaction of being more thoroughly acquainted with the Laws of your Country, and to see those equitably executed of which you was the Judge.

In this you indulged your Love of a valuable Knowledge, and your natural Disposition to Justice and Equity, in a Way the most honourable, most agreeable to a great and good Mind, and a public Spirit.

x · D E D I C A T I O N.

This Part of your Grace's Character, set forth in the plainest Style, will always shine, appear amiable, and be admired.

The following Work, which I humbly present to your GRACE, contains the Origin and Chronology of the most ancient Kingdoms, which, if we except the *Jewish* Nation, have hitherto lain in Obscurity and Confusion. Nor have the Annals of the *Jewish* Nation, which were originally written by the most faithful Historians, been preserved free from Corruption, especially in their Chronology, which hath been altered to such a Degree, as renders the *Hebrew* Accounts of the most ancient Times utterly inconsistent both with the *Mosaic* History itself, and also with the oldest Records and History of all other Nations.

This Corruption, I have shewn, was owing to the *Jews* themselves in later Times; by which many of the most learned *Christian* Writers, both at home and abroad, have been grossly imposed upon.

But as the true *Mosaic* Chronology of Scripture is, by divine Providence, preserved
in

in the uncorrupted *Greek* Translation of the Old Testament, which was made by learned *Jews*, and by Royal Authority, several Centuries before those Corruptions were introduced : and is also contained in the *Jewish* Antiquities of *Josephus*, taken from an uncorrupted *Hebrew* Copy ; I have made this the Foundation of the following Work : and after a long and thorough Examination of the most ancient Pagan Chronology, I have found it entirely consistent, and wonderfully agreeing with this true Chronology of the sacred Writings.

To reconcile the Chronology of the Scripture, whether we follow the *Hebrew* or *Greek* Computations, with that of other ancient Nations in the most early Times, especially the *Egyptian*, *Chaldean*, and *Chinese*, has been thought impossible ; and therefore was never yet attempted. The seemingly immense Numbers of Years contained in the *Egyptian* and *Chaldean* Antiquities and History, have made Chronologers, without due Consideration, reject them as fabulous and romantic : and to rely solely on the

Evidence of the Scripture Relations, for the Knowledge of the first Ages and History of Mankind, which can never be settled by these till the true Chronology of Scripture is settled.

But perceiving that these large Numbers of Years were uniformly carried on and made use of by the most judicious and learned ancient Writers, without any Intimation or Suspicion made by them that they were fabulous; I judged that they were founded on real and true Calculations, and only differed from those of other Nations in the Manner of reckoning, and not in the Chronology itself: and I found at last with great Satisfaction, that the most ancient Computation of *Days* for *Years* amongst the *Chaldæans*, and of *Months* for *Years* amongst the *Egyptians*, warranted by the Testimony of Writers of the greatest Credit, and most conversant in the Histories and Antiquities of these Nations, reconciled all their Accounts together, made them consistent with the Course of Nature, and the History of the first Ages of the World, delivered in the authentic *Mosaic* Writings.

This

This surprizing Agreement of the sacred and profane History, is a great Attestation to the Truth of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, shewing that the best and most valuable Remains of Antiquity, any where preserved in the Traditions and Records of Pagan Nations, carry the Origin of Things, the peopling of the Earth, and first Settlements of Nations, to the same Æra or Point of Time nearly, which the Scripture ascribes to them.

This (my LORD) is a short View of what I have undertaken, and endeavoured to perform in the following Book, which requests the Patronage of your GRACE's Name : and which, considering the many and great Difficulties attending a Work of this kind, may hope for a favourable Reception from the learned World.

I am,

Your GRACE's most obliged,

and devoted humble Servant,

JOHN JACKSON.

SUBSCRIBERS NAMES.

- H**IS Royal Highness G E O R G E Prince of Wales. Large Paper.
 His Royal Highness Prince E D W A R D. L. P.
 His Grace the Duke of Devonshire. L. P.
 His Grace the Duke of Rutland, L. P.
 His Grace the Duke of Kingston. L. P.
 The Right Honourable the Marquis of Granby. L. P.
 The Right Honourable the Earl of Powis. L. P.
 The Right Honourable the Earl of Stamford. L. P.
 The Right Honourable the Countess of Stamford. L. P.
 The Right Honourable the Earl of Harcourt. L. P.
 The Right Honourable Lord Charles Cavendish.
 The Right Honourable Lord William Manners. L. P.
 The Right Honourable Lord Robert Sutton Manners. L. P.
 The Right Honourable Lord George Manners. L. P.
 The Right Honourable Lord Viscount Windsor. L. P.
 The Right Honourable Lord Viscount Tyrconnel. L. P.
 The Right Honourable Lord Viscount Downe. L. P.
 The Right Honourable late Lord Viscount Gallway. L. P.
 The Right Honourable the Widow Viscountess Gallway. L. P.
 The Right Honourable the Lord Viscount Gallway. L. P.
 The Right Honourable the Lord Monson. L. P.
 The Right Honourable the Lord Edgcumbe, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. L. P.
 The Right Honourable the Lord Lumley. L. P.
 The Right Honourable Henry Pelham, Esq; Chancellor of the Exchequer. L. P.
 The Right Honourable Sir George Littleton, a Lord of the Treasury.
 The Right Honourable Arthur Onslow, Esq; Speaker of the House of Commons.
 The Right Honourable Henry Conyngham, Esq. L. P.
 The most Rev. Dr. Thomas Herring, Archbishop of Canterbury. L. P.
 The most Rev. Dr. Matthew Hutton, Archbishop of York. Two Copies, one of them L. P.
 The right Rev. Dr. Thomas Sherlock, Bishop of London.
 The right Rev. Dr. Edward Chandler, late Bishop of Durham. L. P.
 The right Rev. Dr. Joseph Butler, Bishop of Durham. Two Cop. L. P.
 The right Rev. Dr. Benjamin Hoadley, Bishop of Winchester.
 The right Rev. Dr. Isaac Maddox, Bishop of Worcester. L. P.
 The right Rev. Dr. Thomas Secker, Bishop of Oxford. L. P.
 The right Rev. Dr. John Gilbert, Bishop of Sarum.
 The right Rev. Dr. Thomas Gooch, Bishop of Ely. Two Cop. one of them L. P.

The

- The right Rev. Dr. John Thomas, Bishop of Lincoln. L. P.
 The right Rev. Dr. Thomas Hayter, Bishop of Norwich; and Preceptor to his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. Two Cop. L. P.
 The right Rev. Dr. Richard Osbaldiston, Bishop of Carlisle. L. P.
 The right Hon. and right Rev. Dr. James Beauclerk, Bishop of Hereford. L. P.
 The right Rev. Dr. John Conybear, Bishop of Bristol. L. P.
 The right Rev. Dr. George Lavington, Bishop of Exeter.
 The right Rev. and Hon. Dr. Francis Cornwallis, Bishop of Litchfield and Coventry. L. P.
 The right Rev. Dr. John Thomas, Bishop of Peterborough. L. P.
 The right Rev. Dr. Matthias Mawson, Bishop of Chichester.
 The right Rev. Dr. Zachary Pearce, Bishop of Bangor.
 The right Rev. Dr. Edward Cresset, Bishop of Llandaff.
 The right Rev. Dr. Martin Benson, Bishop of Gloucester. L. P.
 The Hon. and right Rev. Dr. Robert Drummond, Bishop of St. Asaph.
 The Hon. and right Rev. Dr. Richard Trevor, Bishop of St. David's. L. P.
 The right Rev. Dr. Clayton, Bishop of Clogher, Ireland. L. P.
 The right Rev. Dr. John Whetcombe, Bishop of Cionfert, Ireland.

A.

- Rev. Mr. Aikin of Kibworth, Leic.
 Mr. William Allwood, Lord of Temple Normanton, Derb.
 Thomas Amory of Chesterton, Esq.
 Rev. Mr. Andrews, Head Schoolmaster of Leicester.
 Mr. John Arthington of Leeds.
 Waring Ashby, Esq; of Quenby, Leic.
 Shuckborough Ashby, Esq; Leic.
 — Afkew, M. D. of London.
 Henry Ashurst, Esq.

B.

- Richard Bagshaw, Esq; of Norton, Derbysh.
 Mr. Baker, Fellow of King's College, Cant.
 John Barker, of Barmby Moor, Esq.
 Rev. Dr. Barton, Canon of Christ's

Church, Oxon. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Barton, Fellow of New College, Oxon. 2 Cop. one of them L. P.

Samuel Barker, Esq; of Lindon, Rutlandsh.

John Battie, Esq; of Warnsworth, Yorksh.

Rev. Mr. Balguy, Fellow of St. John's College, Cant.

Rev. Mr. Barnard, B. D. Fellow of St. John's College, Cant.

Mr. Samuel Baker, Bookseller in London. 3 Cop.

Rev. Dr. Beardsmore, Official of the Archdeaconry of Nottingham.

Rev. Dr. Bentham, Fellow of Oriel College, Oxon.

Mr. Will. Bentley, of Leicester.

Rev. Mr. Berrow, Rector of Finningley, Nottinghamsh.

Mr. Francis Billam, a Surgeon in Leeds.

Rev. Mr. Billio, Rector of Swepston,

ston, Leicestershire.

Rev. Mr. Billingsley, Rector of Newington, Oxford.

Rev. Mr. Birch, Rector of St. Margaret Pattens, London.

John Derbyshire Birkhead, of Inleworth, Esq. L. P.

Sir Walter Blacket, Bart. 2 Cop. L. P.

Rev. Henry Blacket, of Ripon, York.

Mr. John Erasmus Blacket, of Liverpool, Merchant.

William Blackburn, Esq.

Rev. Mr. Bower, Rector of Balborough, Derby.

Book Society at Bawtry, York.

Book Society at Melton, Leic.

Rev. Mr. Bourn, of Ashover, Derby.

Rev. Mr. Bray, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxon.

Mr. Bradbury, a Clerk in the Plantation Office, London.

Mr. Joseph Bright, Merchant in London.

Rev. Dr. Brown, Master of University College, Oxon. 2 Cop.

Dr. Brooke, Regius Professor of Civil Law, Oxon. L. P.

Pusey Brooke, Esq; of Portsmouth.

Rev. Mr. Brogden, of Narborough, Leic.

Rev. Mr. Broughton, Vicar of St. Martin's, Leicester.

Rev. Mr. Brown, of Laughton, York.

Nathanael Brassey, Esq; London.

Rev. Sir William Bunbury, Bart. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Burrow, Rector of Northwingfield, Derby.

Hon. William Burton, Esq; Commissioner of the Excise.

VOL. I.

Rev. Mr. Butterwood, Rector of Claxby, Linc.

C.

Rev. Mr. Calamy, B. D.

Mr. Ad. Calamy, Attorn. at Law.

The Hon. Alex. Hume Campbell, Esq. L. P.

Abraham Castres, Esq; Envoy extraordinary to the Court of Portugal.

Rev. Mr. Cardale, Rector of One-leap, Leic.

Will. Cartwright, Esq; of Aynho, Northampton.

John Cay, Esq.

Rev. Mr. Samuel Chandler. L.P.

Rev. Dr. John Clarke, Dean of Sarum. L. P.

Samuel Clarke, Esq; of Hanover-street, London.

Mrs. Clarke, of Hanover-street, London.

Charles Clarke, Esq; late of Balliol College, Oxon,

Rev. Mr. Clarke, Schoolmaster of Wakefield, Yorksh.

Rev. John Clarke, of Hull, A.M.

George Cooke, Esq; of Warnsworth, York.

Rev. Mr. Cookson, of Leeds.

John Gilbert Cooper, jun. Esq; of Thurgorton, Nott. L. P.

Godfrey Copley Esq; of Sprotbrough, York. L. P.

Rob. Copley, Esq; of Doncaster, York.

Rev. Mr. Costard, Fellow of Wadham College, Oxon.

Tho. Cox, of Nottingham, M.D.

Rev. Mr. Crochley, A. M. of Doncaster, York.

Henry Curren, Esq; of Kildwick in Craven.

Rev. Mr. Curtail, Fellow of Clare Hall, Cant.

c

Rev.

Rev. Mr. Cutler, Chaplain to the Bishop of Winchester.

Mr. Joseph Cradock, sen. of Leicester.

D.

William Danby, Esq.

John Danvers, Esq; of Swedland, Leic. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Darch, Fellow of Baliol College, Oxon.

Mr. William Dawson, of Leeds, Surgeon.

Rev. Dr. Derham, President of St. John's College, Oxon.

Rev. Dr. Doddridge of Northampton.

Rev. Mr. Paul la Dovespe.

Rev. Mr. Dovey, A. M. of Birmingham.

Rev. Dr. Drake, Rector of Treton, Yorksh.

Rev. Mr. John Drake, of Beighton, Derby.

Mrs. Drake. L. P.

William Henry Draper, Esq.

E.

Rev. Mr. Easton, Vicar of Grantham, Linc.

Rev. Dr. Samuel Eaton, of Nottingham.

Richard Edwards, Esq; Master in Chancery.

Sollom Emlyn, Esq; of Lincoln's Inn.

Rev. Mr. Ewer, Canon of Windsor.

Mr. John Ewer, Merchant in London.

F.

Thomas Fairfax, Esq; of Newton, York.

Rev. Dr. Fanshaw, Regius Pro-

fessor of Divinity, Oxon.

Francis Fauquier, Esq. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Fisher, of Sowerby Bridge near Halifax.

Martin Folkes, Esq; President of the Royal Society.

The Hon. Mr. Justice Foster.

Rev. Dr. Foster. L. P.

Rev. Dr. Fortescue, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxon.

Rev. Dr. Fothergill, Fellow of Queen's College, Oxon.

Rev. Dr. Fountain, Dean of York.

Rev. Mr. Fountain.

Rev. Mr. Fois, Rector of Castleford, York.

Richard Frank, Esq; of Cambs, Recorder of Pontefract, York.

William Fullwood, of Huntingdon, M. D.

G.

Rev. Dr. Gally, Rector of St. Giles's in the Fields, London.

Rev. Mr. William Gardiner, of Hucknall, Derby.

Rev. Mr. Garforth, of York. 2 Cop. L. P.

Mr. Richard Garle, of Leicester.

Rev. Mr. Geering, B. D. Fellow of Trinity College, Oxon.

Mr. Philip Gibbs, Blackwell Hall Factor.

Mr. Thomas Giles, Merchant in London.

Mr. Gill, Attorney at Law in Doncaster, Yorksh.

Rev. Mr. James Gisborn, Rector of Stavely, Derby.

John Gore, sen. Esq.

Rev. Mr. Goodall, Archdeacon of Suffolk.

Charles Gray, Esq.

Rev. Dr. Green, Master of Bennet College, and Regius Professor of Divinity, Cant.

Mr.

Mr. John Green, Merchant in Leeds.

Mr. Robert Green, Merchant in Leeds.

Rev. Dr. Gregory, Canon of Christ's Church, Oxon.

Rev. Dr. Richard Grey, Rector of Hinton, Northamp. and Official of the Archdeaconry of Leicester.

Rev. Dr. Zachary Grey, of Cambridge.

Rev. Dr. Griffith, Rector of Ectington, Derby. L. P.

Rev. Mr. John Griffith, Rector of Hansworth, Yorksh.

Rev. Mr. Grimshaw, of Illingworth near Halifax.

H.

Mrs. Hallows, of Nottingham. 3 Cop. one of them L. P.

Rev. Mr. Van Hamstede.

William Hanbury, Esq; of Kellmarsh, Northamp.

Mr. Samuel Handley, Merchant in London.

Major Edward Harvey. L. P.

Stanhope Harvey, Esq; of Womersley, York.

John Harvey, Esq; of Ickwellbury, Bedford.

Thomas Hatchet, Esq; of Southwell, Notting.

Rev. Mr. Hayter.

Sir Arthur Hefilridge, Bart. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Heaton, sen. Fellow of Bennet College, Cant.

Rev. Mr. Heathcote, Rector of Barkby, Leic.

— Heberden, of London, M.D.

Rev. Dr. John Hoadly, Chancellor of the Diocese of Winchester.

Mrs. Hoadly, of Chelsea.

John Holland, M. D. of Chesterfield, Derby.

William Holbrooke, of Leicester, M. D.

Mr. James Hodges, Bookfeller in London. L. P.

John Hood, Esq; of Bardon Park, Leic.

Rev. Mr. Hubbard, Fellow of Emanuel College, Cant.

Rev. Dr. Huddesford, President of Trinity College, Oxon.

Rev. Mr. Hudson, of Swine near Hull.

Rev. Dr. Hughs, Dean of Bangor.

Rev. Dr. Obadiah Hughs. L. P.

Rev. Dr. Hunt, Canon of Christ's Church, Oxon. and Regius Professor of Hebrew, etc. L. P.

William Huet, Esq; of Stretton, Leic.

Rev. Dr. Hutchins, Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxon.

J.

Mr. Thomas Jee, of Leicester.

John Jeffreys, Esq.

Rev. Dr. Jenner, President of Magdalen College, Oxon. and Margaret Professor of Divinity. L. P.

Matthew Immyns, Esq; of Nottingham. L. P.

Rev. Dr. Isham, Rector of Lincoln College, Oxon.

Rev. Mr. Jortin, Rector of St. Dunstan's in the East, London.

K.

Sam. Kay, M. D. of Manchester.

Rev. Dr. Keene, Master of St. Peter's College, Cant. since Bishop of Chester. 3 Cop. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Keepe, Fellow of King's College, Cant.

Rev. Mr. Kennion, of Wickerly, Yorksh.

Matt. Kenrick, Esq; of London.

Dr. King, LL.D. Principal of St. Mary's

Mary's Hall, Oxon. L. P.

Rev. Dr. Kirkshaw, Vicar of
Leeds.

I.

Rev. Mr. John Lambert, Rector
of Foston, Leic.

Edwin Lascelles, Esq. L. P.

Mr. Edward Lawrence, Mer-
chant in London.

Mr. George Lee, Goldsmith in
London.

Henry Legh, Esq; of High Legh.

Charles Legh, Esq; of Adlington.

George Legh, D. D. Vicar of
Halifax. L. P.

Sir Peter Leicester, of Brazen Nose
College, Oxon.

Sir William Lowther, Bart. of
Swillington, York.

Rev. Mr. John Lewis, of Hack-
John Lister, Esq; of Bawtry.

Rev. Mr. Ludlam, of Bawtry,
York. 2 Cop.

Rev. Mr. William Ludlam, Fel-
low of St. John's College, Cant.

The Book Society at Leicester.

M.

Rev. Mr. Majendie.

Rev. Owen Manning, A.M. Fel-
low of Queen's College, Cant.

Rev. Mr. Masters, Fellow of Ben-
net College, Cant.

Dr. Maty.

Richard Mead, M. D.

The Hon. William Mellish, Esq;
Commissioner of Excise. 2 Cop. one
of them L. P.

Edward Mellish, Esq; of Blyth,
Nottingh. L. P.

Joseph Mellish, Esq; Merchant.

Rev. Mr. Metcalfe, Rector of
Narborough, Leic.

Rev. Mr. Metcalfe, Rector of
Toft, Cambridg.

Rev. Mr. Michel, Rector of Ek-
rin, Nottingh.

Rev. Mr. Michel, Fellow of
Queen's College, Cant.

— Milner, M. D. of Leeds.

Thomas Micklethwait, Esq; of
Leeds.

Rev. Mr. De Miffy, of Marybone.

Mrs. De Miffy, of Marybone.

Mr. Mixon, Merchant, of Lynn.

Sir Charles Mollineux, Bart. of
Feverhall, Nottingh.

Mr. Thomas Moore, Woollen-
draper, London.

— Morehead, Esq; of Cavendish-
Square, London.

Sir J. Mordaunt, Knight of the
Bath. L. P.

Rev. William Morgan, D.D. Sen.
Fellow of Trinity College, Cant.

Sir Oswald Mosely, Bart.

Rev. Mr. Mosely, Rector of War-
sop, Notting.

Rev. Robert Moreton, Rector of
Middlewich.

Rev. Dr. Moss, Rector of St.
James's, Westminster.

Rev. Mr. Murgatroyd, of Leeds.
N.

Francis Naylor, Esq.

Rev. Dr. Newcome, Dean of Ro-
chester. 2 Cop.

Rev. Mr. Newton, Fellow of Je-
sus College, Cant.

Rev. Dr. Niblett, Warden of All-
Souls College, Oxon. 2 Cop. one of
them L. P.

Mr. John Noon, Bookseller in
London. 6 Cop.

O.

Rev. Mr. Ogden, B. D. Fellow
of St. John's College, Cant.

John Offley, Esq. L. P.

Joseph Offley, Esq; of Norton,
Derb.

Mr. Osborne, Bookseller in Gray's
Inn. 6 Cop.

Rev.

Rev. Mr Otter, Curate of Ed-
winstow, Nottingh.

P.

Mr. Paget, of Leicester.
Mr. William Palmer, Attorney at
Law, London.
Rev. Mr. Parker, Fellow of Ba-
liol College, Oxon.
Rev. Dr. Pardo, Principal of Je-
sus College, Oxon. 2 Cop. one of
them L. P.
James Payne, Esq; Clerk of his
Majesty's Board of Works.
Henry Partridge, Esq; Recorder
of Lynn.
Mr. Thomas Pares, Attorney at
Law in Leicester.
Mr. Thomas Peck, Attorney at
Law in Leicester.
Sir Charles Peyton, Bart.
The late John Plumptre, Esq; of
Nottingham.
John Plumptre, Esq; Commis-
sioner of the Stamps.
Late Thomas Pochin, Esq; of
Barkby, Leic.
Rev. Mr. Powell, Fellow of St.
John's College, Cant.
Rev. Dr. Purnal, Master of New
College, Oxon. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Thomas Pyle, Minister
of Lynn.
Rev. Dr. Edmund Pyle, Arch-
deacon of York.
Rev. Mr. Philip Pyle, Vicar of
Melksham, Wilts.

R.

Rev. Dr. Radlif, Master of Pem-
broke Hall, Oxon.
Rev. Dr. David Rennels.
Rev. Dr. Richardson, Master of
Emanuel College, Cant. L. P.

Mr. Richardson, Bookseller in
London.

John Roberts, Esq.
Rev. Dr. Rooke, Master of
Chrill's College, Cant.
John Rotheram, Esq; of Dron-
field, Derb.
Mrs. Ruding, of Leicester.
William Ruding, Esq; of Lei-
cester. L. P.
Rogers Ruding, Esq; of Leicester.
Rev. Dr. Rutherford, Fellow of
St. John's College, Cant.

S.

Rev. Mr. Sandford, sen. Fellow
of Baliol College, Oxon.
Sir George Savile, Bart. of Ruf-
ford, Notting.
Rev. Mr. Sedgwick, Master of
Queen's College, Cant. 2 Cop. one
of them L. P.
John Selwin, Esq.
Rev. Dr. Sharpe, Prebendary of
Durham.
— Short, of Sheffield, M. D.
Thomas Selwood, Esq; of Bil-
lam, York.
Rev. Mr. Simons, of Belgrave,
Leic.
Rev. Mr. Joseph Simmons.
William Simpson, Esq; of Stain-
ford, York. L. P.
Rev. John Simpson, Esq; of Rhe-
nishaw, Derb.
Mr. Nathanael Simpson, of Lei-
cester.
Francis Sitwell, Esq; of Rheni-
shaw, Derb. 3 Cop. one of them L. P.
William Sitwell, Esq; Merchant
in London. 4 Cop. one of them L. P.
Late Thomas Boothby Skrymser,
Esq. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Smith, Master of Tri-
nity

nity College, Cant. 2 Cop. one of them L. P.

Rev. Dr. Smith, Provost of Queen's College, Oxon. 2 Cop. one of them L. P.

Rev. Mr. Smith, Fellow of Caius College, Cant.

Mr. Smith, Burfar of King's College, Cant.

Stephen Soame, Esq.

Rev. Mr. Stephens, Rector of Bottesford, Leic.

Rev. Mr. Statham, of Loughborough.

Rev. Dr. Stillingfleet, Prebendary of Durham.

Andrew Stone, Esq. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Stokes, Rector of Blaby, Leic.

Rev. Mr. Steuart, Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cant.

Rev. Dr. Stukely, Rector of St. George's Queen Square, London.

Rev. Mr. Sutcliffe, of Heptonstall near Halifax.

Rev. Mr. Sutton, Rector of Averham, Nottingham.

John Sutton, M. D. of Leicester.

Rev. Mr. Swainson, Fellow of Christ's College, Cant.

Rev. Mr. Swiney, A. M.

Rev. John Swinton, of Knutsford.

Rev. Dr. Sykes, Dean of Burien.

T.

Rev. Dr. Taylor, Chancellor of the Diocese of Lincoln.

— Taylor, M. D. of London.

Rev. Mr. Tempest, of Sheffield.

Rev. Dr. Terrick, Residentiary of St. Paul's, London.

Rev. Dr. Thomas, Rector of Blechingly, Surry.

John Thornhagh, Esq; of Shireoaks, Notting.

Bathe Thornhill, Esq; Derby.

Mr. Henry Thornhill, of Chesterfield, Derby.

Rev. Mr. William Tiffin, Chaplain of Wigston's Hospital, Leic.

Rev. Mr. Tomlinson, Vicar of Blyth, Nottingham.

Rev. Mr. Totton, A. M. Fellow of St. John's College, Cant.

Mr. Pet. Touchet, of Manchester.

The Hon. Tho. Townsend, Esq; Teller of the Exchequer.

Rev. Dr. Trow, Fellow of Merton College, Oxon.

Rev. Dr. Trimnel, Archdeacon of Leicester. 2 Cop. one of them L. P.

Rich. Turbut, Esq; of Doncaster.

Rev. Mr. Turner, of Freeton, York.

John Twisleton, Esq; York.

V.

Mr. Frederick Vandermeulen, Merchant in London.

Mr. Gerrard Vanneck, London.

Rev. Dr. Vernon, Rector of Bloomsbury, London.

William Villa Real, Esq.

W.

Rev. Mr. Warburton, Fellow of Jesus College, Cant.

Patientius Ward, Esq; of Hutton Pannel, Yorksh.

Mrs. Ward, of Aynho, Northam.

Rev. Joseph Ward, A. M. Vicar of Prustbury.

Rev. Ferdinando Warner, Rector of Queenhith.

Rev. Mr. Watkins, Rector of Clifton, Stafford.

Rev. Mr. Webber, Rector of Exeter College, Oxon.

— Wells, M. D. of Sheffield.

Rev. Mr. Welsh, A. M. of Sowerby near Halifax.

Edward Weston, Esq; of Whitehall, London.

Mr.

Mr. Rich. Weston, of Leicester.
Rev. Mr. Whitworth, of Coley
near Halifax.

Mr. John Whiston, Bookseller. 3
Cop.

Rev. Mr. Wigley, sen. Fellow of
Christ's College, Cant.

Rev. Mr. Wighton, A. M. Rec-
tor of Garforth, Yorksh.

Rev. Dr. Wilcox, Master of Clare
Hall, Cant. 2 Cop. one of them L. P.

— Wilmot, M. D. Physician to
his Majesty. 2 Cop.

Rev. Dr. Willson, sen. Fellow of
Trinity College, Cant.

Richard Willson, Esq; Recorder
of Leeds.

Rev. Mr. Willson, A. M. Rector
of Feverfall, Nottingham.

John Williams Esq; of Gloucester.

Rev. Mr. Edward Williams, of
Nottingham.

Mr. Will. Wilkins, of London.

William Woolaston, Esq; of St.
James's Square, London.

John Woodyeare, Esq; of Crokil,
Yorksh. L. P.

Late Sir Isaac Woolaston, of
Loseby, Leic. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Worthington, of Lei-
cester.

Daniel Wray, Esq; London.

Rev. Mr. Christ. Wray, Chaplain
to Trinity House in Hull.

William Wright, Esq; Recorder
of Leicester. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Wright, of Romely,
Derb. L. P.

Will. Wright, Esq; of Mottram.

Y.

Thomas Yarborough, Esq; of
Camfal, York.

Rev. Dr. Yarborough, Principal
of Brazen-Nose College, Oxon. 2
Cop. one of them L. P.

Rev. Dr. Yarborough, Rector of
Tewing.

The Hon. Mr. York. L. P.

Rev. Dr. Young, Prebendary of
Westminster.

Robert Young, Esq.

Rev. Mr. Yates, Vicar of Cloyne,
Derb.

Add to the Nobility,

The Right Hon. the Earl of March.

P R E F A C E.

CHRONOLOGY has been justly called the *Soul of History*; for without Chronology History is lifeless, and no better than a dead Body without Sense or Understanding: and unless the Times of historical Narrations are in some measure ascertained, History will be little preferable to Romance.

Without some fixed Chronological *Æras* and Epochs, to which historical Relations may be referred, we shall be in the same Confusion about them, as we should be in geographical Descriptions of *Places, Countries, Cities, Rivers*, etc. without having the Longitude and Latitude of them ascertained.

Chronology therefore is altogether necessary to History, is the Eye by which we are able to trace the Footsteps of it up to the Beginning of its Existence, and of Time itself.

It must be both highly useful and satisfactory to Beings of so short a Duration as Man is, to be able to discover the Original of Time and Beginning of Things: to live, as it were, in all past Ages, and fix the History of Mankind to certain Epochs, whence we can carry it down to its utmost Period; and so know the Times of the most ancient past Transactions almost as well as those of the present Age.

In all Ages, the Genealogies of Families, and Annals of the History and Reigns of Kings and States, have been made by public Authority, and preserved with the greatest Exactness and Care; and accounted inestimable and sacred, and laid up in Temples as the safest Repository of them. And it is the Business of Chronology to search after, collect, and put in Order the Remains of them, and to fix them to their true Times, by amending the Errors and Corruptions which, through Length of Ages, Mistakes of Writers, and of their Copiers, have crept into and long possessed them.

Chronology therefore is concerned, not only to clear and retrieve Time that has been corrupted or lost, but to restore past Years, as far as may be, to their original and true Epochs, Cycles, and Æras; that they may take those Places again which Nature at first gave them; and that their Course may run regularly, uniformly, and without Confusion.

Hence it appears, that Chronology is a Part of natural Knowledge or Philosophy, and is of the greatest Importance to History, and renders it both entertaining and a real Science.

It must indeed be confessed, that there have been for many Ages great Difficulties and Perplexities in Chronology, especially in the most early and remote Times; which are owing to the Loss or Corruption of the original Records both of sacred and profane History: and all that can be done to restore the true Chronology of them is, by comparing the most ancient and authentic Accounts

counts together, and carrying them up as near as may be, to their original Epochs ; and shewing their Agreement with one another, with the Course of Nature, and that *Æra* of the World which is fixed on the most unquestionable Evidence.

This I have endeavoured to do in the following Work.

The most ancient Chronology is contained in the Writings of *Moses*, whose Epoch is the Creation of the World, and which reacheth to his own Time, and is carried on thence with the greatest Accuracy by faithful Historians, who lived some in, and others near the Times mentioned in their Writings, which were taken from the most authentic public Records.

The *Chaldean*, *Assyrian*, and *Egyptian* Chronology and Antiquities, follow those of Scripture, and reach the highest after them (except the *Phœnician*, which are very imperfectly transmitted to us) and had learned Men been able to reconcile the Accounts of these with the History and Chronology of Scripture, to which they originally agreed, the oldest Times, and the Histories of the first Ages of Mankind, and of the first and most famous Empires, would be ascertained.

But the Chronology of Scripture, as it now stands in the *Masorete*, or present *Hebrew* Copies, is utterly irreconcilable to all the oldest and best attested Accounts of the *Chaldeans*, *Assyrians*, and *Egyptians*, taken from the public and authentic Annals of these Nations ; and therefore if that be true, the Chronology of these, and, I might add, of all other ancient Kingdoms, must be false ;

and their highest Antiquities and History no other than Romance.

Yet it appears, that the Chronology of all the most ancient Kingdoms before-mentioned, to which that of the *Chinese* Annals may be added, is consistent and agrees together, though it greatly disagrees with the present *Hebrew* Chronology of the *Mosaic* Writings.

This Difficulty has never been well considered by our greatest Chronologers, *Scaliger*, *Petavins*, Archbishop *Ussher*, Sir *J. Marsham*, Bishop *Llboyd*, and others; who taking for granted that the *Masorete Hebrew* Chronology is right, and the true and original Chronology of the *Mosaic* Scripture, have rejected the larger Accounts of the *Chaldean*, *Assyrian*, and *Egyptian* Chronology, as fictitious and fabulous; or have in an arbitrary Manner cut off and contracted their Times, to reduce them to the Standard of the lesser Chronology of the *Hebrew* Text.

Thus *Scaliger* thinking the *Egyptian* Dynasties to be all successive, found they outrun his *Julian* Period; and exceeded the Epoch of the *Mosaic* Creation, as he reckoned it, by 1336 Years; and he was forced to feign (1) another *Julian* Period, to comprehend the first four Dynasties; and thereby to connect them with his true *Julian* Period, which commenced under the fifth *Egyptian* Dynasty. Hereby those famous Dynasties lay in *Egyptian* Darkness. *Scaliger* had no better Luck with the *Chaldean* and *Assyrian* Dynasties, which he found

(1) Canon. Ifagog. lib. ii. p. 124. lib. iii. p. 279.

commenced above two hundred Years before the Flood, according to the Chronology of the present *Hebrew* Text.

The learned *Petavius*, the Adversary of *Scaliger*, had no better Success; and knew no more of the *Egyptian* Dynasties than *Scaliger* did: but he was so wise as not to meddle with them. He also took them to be successive, and therefore esteems many of the first to be fictitious; and would have them omitted, and the rest to be regulated by his own Chronology, by which he brings the Epoch of them within 153 Years of the Flood, which is sufficiently absurd. This is also his Epoch of the *Assyrian* Empire; and he is forced to reject the first *Chaldean* and *Arabian* Dynasties, which preceded his *Belus* and *Ninus* (whom he weakly supposes to be *Nimrod* and *Assur*) as fictitious (2).

Sir *J. Marsham* knew more of the *Egyptian* Dynasties than either *Scaliger* or *Petavius*. He saw that some of them must be contemporary; but he knew not which they were, and others he rejected as fictitious.

Our learned *Usher* rejected all the *Egyptian* Dynasties precedent to that of the *Shepherds*, [which is the fifteenth in *Africanus's* History of *Manetho*, and the seventeenth in *Eusebius*] as being inconsistent with his Chronology. He has rightly distinguished between the *Babylonian* and *Assyrian Belus*; but by a strange *Metachronism*, has fixed *Ninus*, Son of the *Assyrian Belus*, so low as to the Year before *Christ* 1267, and the Æra of the *Assyrian* Monar-

(2) Doct. temp. tom. ii. lib. ix. c. 13, 15.

chy to the Year before *Christ* 1322. And not regarding the Succession and Times of the following *Assyrian* Kings, makes the Duration of it no more than 520 Years, instead of 1300 Years, or more, as the *Assyrian* Annals made it.

To rectify these and many other Absurdities and Difficulties, and to restore true Chronology to the History of Scripture, and that of the most ancient Kingdoms mentioned in it, especially the *Chaldean*, *Assyrian*, and *Egyptian*; and to shew the Consistency and Agreement of the several Æras of these Kingdoms with the *Mosaic* Chronology, is the chief Design of the following Work.

In the Beginning of this Undertaking I thought, that if the *Egyptian* and *Assyrian* Dynasties could be disveloped from the Darkness and Confusion in which they have laid, ever since the Age of *Africanus*; and the true successive Order and Times of the *Egyptian* and *Assyrian* Kings could be settled and fixed to certain Epochs, they would afford great Light and Assistance to ascertain the true Chronology of Scripture. And as there is a larger and a lesser Chronology of Scripture, the latter in the present *Hebrew* Text, and the former in the *Septuagint Greek* Version from the *Hebrew*, which differ from each other near 1400 Years, in the Interval from the Creation to the Birth of *Abraham*, these forementioned ancient Epochs would be a great Help, to determine in which of the two Computations the original Scripture-Chronology was contained.

In

In this Interval it was easy to observe, that the Genealogies in the present *Hebrew* Text, which constitute the Chronology of the Scripture-History, were neither consistent with themselves, or with the Course of Nature and Propagation of Mankind, nor with the Scripture History of the *Hebrews*, and of other Nations bordering upon them, and mentioned in the *Mosaic* History.

All this I have shewn at large in the first Part of the following Work ; and hence it is evident, and not to be doubted, that the present *Hebrew* Text is greatly corrupted, and the Chronology of *Moses* lessened many Centuries ; and the Corruption is not accidental but plainly voluntary and designed.

Farther it appears, that the present *Hebrew* Computations are no older than the second Century of the *Christian* Æra ; and were never known before to the *Jews*, or to any *Greek* Writers of the *Jewish* History : these therefore cannot be the true Scripture-Chronology, or the original Chronology of the *Hebrew* Text ; which can only be restored by the Evidence and Testimony of the more ancient *Jewish* Writers.

It is known, that the Septuagint *Greek* Version was made by *Jews*, in the Reign of *Ptolemy Philadelphus* King of *Egypt*, and by his Authority, from an *Hebrew* Copy which was three Times older than any Copies now known to be extant ; and this Version was received and read by public Authority in the *Jewish* Synagogues every where, as being a faithful uncorrupt Translation ; and its Credit and Authority was never questioned for about

400 Years, or till the second Century of the *Christian* Æra.

Now, if it appears that the Chronology of the Septuagint *Greek* Version has been preserved uncorrupted, and is the same with that of the *Hebrew* Copy, from whence it was originally taken, what Doubt can remain of its being the true *Hebrew* Chronology of *Moses*? But I have proved that the Septuagint Chronology is confirmed, by two ancient *Greek* Writers of *Jewish* History, *Demetrius* and *Eusebius*; the first of whom lived in the Year before *Christ* 222, and sixty-four Years only after this *Greek* Version was made; and the latter wrote about 174 Years before the *Christian* Æra, and 112 Years after the Time of the same Version.

And both these Writers, in their Computations, agree entirely with that of the Septuagint. After these, in the first Century of *Christianity*, *Josephus*, the famous and most learned *Jewish* Priest, in his *Jewish* Antiquities, in which he assures us that he followed the *Hebrew* Copies, has the same Chronology with that of the Septuagint. So that the Chronology of the Septuagint *Greek* Version, was no other than the *Hebrew* Chronology in the Age of *Josephus*; and several Centuries before to the Reign of *Ptolemy Philadelphus*; and being still the same at this Day, cannot but be esteemed by all learned and impartial Judges, as the original *Hebrew* Chronology: and the present Chronology of the *Masorete Hebrew* Copies, being so much different from that of the ancient Copies used by the Septuagint Translators and
by

by *Josephus*, and received as authentic by the whole *Jewish* Nation for 400 Years, must be corrupted and ought to be rejected.

The original *Hebrew* Chronology being restored is of the highest Authority, and undoubtedly agreed with the true Computations and Annals of all other Nations. The Genealogies of it are perfectly consistent, and agreeable to the Course of Nature; and the History of it in the most early Ages, is suitable to the State of Mankind in those Ages. The *Chaldean* Antiquities and Chronology, both before and after the Flood, I found to be perfectly corresponding to the Ages of the *Hebrew* History; and suppose Epochs which are quite agreeable to the Accounts of it. And the *Assyrian* Dynasty from *Ninus* (when four Kings inserted by *Africanus* are removed and restored to their true Dynasty of the preceding *Babylonian* Kings) and the History of his Reign is consonant to the Scripture History of that Time. The placing four Reigns after *Ninus*, which really were precedent to him, carried his Age too high by many Years, and up to the *Babylonian Belus*, and made him thought to be his Son; and rendered the History of his Reign irreconcilable to the Relations of Scripture, and other ancient History.

This Error of *Africanus* must for ever have puzzled and confounded all Chronologers since his Time, if it had not been discovered by a Fragment of *Cydenus* from the *Babylonian* Annals, which shews the true Places of these Kings in the *Babylonian* Dynasty, beginning

ning with *Belus* and ending with the last of these Kings, who was conquered and succeeded by *Ninus*, with whose Reign the *Assyrian* Dynasty commenced.

This valuable Fragment I have now published, and shewn the inestimable Service of it in Chronology.

But the greatest Difficulty was to settle the true successive *Egyptian* Dynasties. For it is apparent that many of them are contemporary, and that fifteen only out of thirty were successive.

This has hitherto been too hard a Task for all Chronologers since the Age of *Africanus*, who first confounded and interrupted the Series of them, by Insertion of collateral Dynasties, and made thirty in Succession instead of fifteen, though his own Account of them from *Manetho* shewed there were no more than fifteen successive Dynasties, from the Epoch or Beginning to the End of the *Egyptian* Monarchy.

Eusebius seems to have known the true successive Dynasties; but he mangled, lessened, and misrepresented the two first, to bring them to the Epoch of his Chronology.

From *Apollodorus Syncellus* has happily preserved *Eratosthenes's* Catalogue of the *Theban* Kings, made from the most ancient Records of *Thebes* in the upper *Egypt* by royal Authority: and from the Time of the Reign of one of the last Kings, which is mentioned by *Dicaearchus*, an ancient *Greek* Historian, it appears when the first King, *Menes* [who is also the first King of the first *Egyptian* Dynasty of *Manetho*] began to reign. This
was

was the Key to open and discover the true successive *Egyptian* Dynasties. The Difficulty laid in finding out the two first of the successive fifteen (the thirteen last from the eighteenth to the thirtieth being on all hands agreed to be successive). The first Dynasty, of which *Menes* was the first King, must be one of the two sought for ; and there remained none but the famous *Shepherd-Dynasty* for the other, which was disjointed both from the first and the eighteenth ; but it appears from *Josephus* and *Syncellus* that it really was the seventeenth Dynasty, as *Eusebius* also made it ; and it immediately preceded the eighteenth Dynasty, as the History of *Manetho* in *Josephus* plainly shews.

I made no doubt therefore of having discovered the true successive fifteen Dynasties of the Kings of *Egypt*, which contained the whole Period of that ancient and renowned Empire ; and in the Computation of the Years of them, I found they brought the first King *Menes* within fourteen or fifteen Years of the Time where he is placed in the Catalogue of *Eratoſthenes*, and this small Difference is also accounted for.

This sufficiently cleared and removed all the Obscurities and Embarrassments of the *Egyptian* Chronology, contained in their Dynasties, which were transcribed from the Annals of *Memphis* ; and shewed so near an Agreement of them with the *Theban* Dynasty, that no longer doubt remained of the true successive Order of the Dynasties of *Manetho*, which all Chronologers have hitherto studied in vain to find out.

The *Egyptian* Chronology being settled, I found it to be exactly consonant to the original *Hebrew* Chronology and History of Scripture ; but entirely dissonant to and inconsistent with the lesser *Masorete* Chronology.

The *Egyptian* Kingdom commenced suitably to the Epochs of others the most ancient Kingdoms, and the first peopling of it agreed to the Scripture Account of the Dispersion of Mankind with great Exactness.

The *Shepherd-Dynasty* not only corresponded with the Time of the *Israelites* going into *Egypt*, but perfectly agrees with the Scripture-History of that famous Migration, and gives considerable Light to it. And it was no small Satisfaction, that the genuine Antiquities and Chronology of the *Egyptians*, *Chaldeans*, and *Assyrians*, agreed to so much Exactness, and with so great Harmony, with the original *Hebrew* Antiquities and Chronology.

The *Chinese* Chronology is of equal, if not of superior Authority to the *Egyptian* ; not only because it cannot possibly have been corrupted by Communication with other Nations ; or Intermixture with or Accommodation to any Accounts of any other People : but also and principally because it is taken from authentic and most ancient Records ; and is pure and genuine, without the least Mixture of Fable, which the *Chinese* would never permit to be inserted in their History, and which after the Rise of Idolatry infected and corrupted the *Chaldean*, *Egyptian*, and *Greek* Antiquities, so as to confound and perplex their real History : and to require much
 Trouble

Trouble to develop it, and discover the true Times and Facts hid under fabulous Narrations.

The *Mosaic, Egyptian, Chaldean, Assyrian, and Chinese* Antiquities and Chronology, which are the most important, take up the two First Volumes of the following Work.

The Third contains the *Phœnician* Antiquities and Chronology, which have not been understood by the learned Bishop *Cumberland*, or by the more learned *Borchart*, or any others who have treated of them.

After this, the Antiquity of *Letters*, and their Progress and Variations both in Number and Sound, and the several Alphabets and Ways of writing them, are largely treated of and explained; and with them the Migrations of the ancient *Pelasgi* are traced, and their Settlements ascertained, which will discover the Original of the most ancient Kingdoms in *Greece* and *Italy*.

The Origin of all the most ancient Oracles and Mysteries, and the Antiquity and Chronology of them, are fully shewn. The *Sicyonian* and *Argive* Æras, with those of the *Argonautic* Expedition, and of the Destruction of *Troy*, and of the *Olympiads*, are treated of and settled; and several other ancient Æras are fixed.

The capital Points of ancient Chronology, which have so long employed the Labour and Learning of the greatest Chronologers, who have ever been puzzled with them, and disputed about them to no Purpose, are those which I have mentioned, and which I principally endeavour to clear of their Obscurities and Confusion;
to

to set them in their true Light ; and to shew their Agreement and Connection with one another. And I hope my Endeavours, intended for the Service of *Learning* and *Truth*, will be favourably accepted by the learned World ; and that, if I have succeeded and restored Chronology, I shall be thought to have done no inconsiderable Service to them ; and I shall think many Years well spent in so useful a Study.

But whatever I have done, I submit to the Judgment and Candor of the learned, especially the Prelates and those learned Persons of both Universities, who with Readiness have encouraged the Work.

They are sensible of the Difficulties attending Chronology, and of the Labour necessary to be employed in it ; and as, no doubt, there may be some Errors in the present Work, the Author is desirous that it may be strictly examined, and is willing to amend whatever Errors can be found in it.

How easy it is to find Faults in the Writings of the most learned Chronologers, and how difficult to avoid as great ones self ; and to shew where the Error lies on one Side, and the Truth on the other, appears from the learned chronological Work of *Petavius* against the most learned *Scaliger*.

Petavius has shewn many Errors in the Chronology of *Scaliger*, whom he has treated not very favourably ; but he is guilty also of many himself ; has often split on the same Rocks ; and was far from being able to clear or amend what he found fault with, whether with re-
gard

gard to the Difficulties of the Scripture-Chronology and History ; or to those in the *Egyptian, Chaldean, Assyrian*, and others. The same may be observed in the Chronology of the learned *Vignoles*. He has found many Faults in *Scaliger, Petavius, Usher, Sir J. Marsham*, and others, and tired his Reader with a long Detail of them : but when he has done, he has informed his Reader of nothing better ; he has not amended any Errors or established any Truths ; and the Epochs of his own Chronology (excepting one or two) are all wrong and unsupported.

The Method I have taken is not to pull in pieces the various Schemes of other Chronologers, which, however easy, would be an endless and an useless Work ; but in the first place to establish my own System upon full and good Evidence ; to restore all the ancient *Æras* to their true Time ; to clear up the Difficulties occurring in them ; to examine and amend some principal Errors of the most learned Chronologers both ancient and modern ; and to reduce all the ancient Chronology to one entire and consistent System.

Chronolo-

Chronological Antiquities:

OR, THE

ANTIQUITIES

AND

CHRONOLOGY

OF THE

MOST ANTIENT KINGDOMS.

Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.

THE History of the Creation wrote by *Moses*, and his subsequent History of Mankind to the universal Deluge, and thence of the *Jewish* and other Nations to his own Time, is not only the most ancient Account of Things, but the most authentic that ever was recorded.

God revealed to *Adam*, the first Man, what related to the Creation and to his own and *Eve's* Formation. From him it was delivered down to *Seth*, and from *Seth* to *Enoch*; and from him to his Son *Methuselah*; and from him to *Lamech* and *Noah*. After the Flood, the History of the antediluvian Ages was derived from *Noah* to his three Sons *Sem*, *Ham*, and *Japheth*. *Sem* and his Descendants, who lived in *Chaldæa*, communicated it to *Abraham*, the Father and Founder of the *Hebrew* or *Jewish* Nation; he delivered it to his Posterity, from whom it was derived to *Moses*.

VOL. I.

B

By

2 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

By these several Conveyances from the Beginning the most valuable History of the World and of Mankind for a long Series of Ages was preserved, and never any where so faithfully recorded as in the Writings of *Moses*: and very little of which has been for many Ages preserved but in his Books alone. For though it be certain that the History of the Creation and antediluvian Ages was delivered to *Japhet* and *Ham* by *Noah*, as well as to *Sem*; and by them and their Posterity was known long before the Time of *Moses*; and recorded in the most ancient Annals of *Chaldaea*, *Phœnicia*, and *Egypt*, from whence the *Greeks* received their oldest Cosmogony and genealogical History; yet were all their Accounts very anciently mixed with Superstition and idolatrous Fables as appears from the oldest Remains of them; and which sufficiently shew they were all derived originally from the same Fountain of Truth, by their Agreement with the *Mosaic* History in several Parts of them; though they are grievously corrupted with a Mixture of superstitious Fables, by which Idolatry was propagated through most Parts of the Earth: whilst the genuine and uncorrupted History of *Moses* is free from these Superstitions, and preserves entire the true original Notions concerning God's Creation of the World, and his Providence over Mankind; and by which Men are taught the pure Worship of God, and a Dependence on his Providence, and the Practice of universal Righteousness, in which the primitive Religion consisted.

Moses introduces his Account of the Creation with saying, *Gen. i. 1, 2, In the Beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth. And the Earth was without Form and void (or empty, viz. of Inhabitants) and Darkness was upon the Face of the Deep: and the Spirit of God moved upon the Face of the Waters.*

Here *Moses*, the divine Historian, shews that the (1) terrestrial World had a Beginning, and was made or formed by God out of a dark and confused Chaos, in which Water, and Earth, and the Elements and Principles of all Things were mixed together without Order

(1) The *Heaven* may be taken to comprehend the several celestial systems of the Sun, Moon, Planets, and Stars which were created before the Formation of the Earth, of which only *Moses* gives a particular account, and to which his History primarily relates.

in

in one Mass. The first Act of God towards the Creation or Formation of this System was his causing a strong Wind, called (2) *the Spirit of God*, to move upon the Waters. This Spirit or Wind of God, by its powerful Energy, separated the fluid chaotic Mass into two Parts, and cleared the Water from its Mixture with the Mud, and brought it together upon the Superficies of the Earth, which it covered all round; and so is said to have *moved* or *breathed upon the Face of the Waters*. How long this divine Spirit or Wind of God continued to move and act upon the Waters cleared from the grosser Earth, *Moses* does not tell us; but it is probable that it continued the first three Days of the Creation, which were effected by its Operation. For by its acting incessantly on the thick gloomy Atmosphere, and breaking and thinning the gross Parts of it, which prevented the Sun's Beams from penetrating it, by degrees Light fell upon the Chaos; and by the Revolution of the Earth about its Axis at the same Time, which might be caused by the divine Spirit or Wind of God, the first Day's Creation of Night and Day was formed, *℥* 3, 4, 5. *And God said, Let there be Light, and there was Light.* This *St. Paul* expresseth with great Propriety, saying, 2 *Cor.* iv. 6. *that God commanded the Light to shine out of Darkness*; intimating, as *Moses* also does, that the Fountain of Light was created before (as we shall see presently) but was obstructed by the thick chaotic Atmosphere from shining upon the Earth. *And God saw the Light that it was good, and God divided the Light from the Darkness. And God called the Light Day, and the Darkness he call'd Night, and the Evening and the Morning were the first Day.* *℥*

The same divine and almighty Spirit or Wind of God as it gradually dispersed the gross Parts of the chaotic Atmosphere, which surrounded the Earth, and made Light to shine through it, so at the same Time it raised plenteous Vapours from the Waters below, which were carried into the Atmosphere, and were supported by a purer Air which contained them; so that they were divided from the Waters below: this was the Work of the second Day's Creation. And this Expansion

(2) So *Theodoret* understands it: and observes that *Wind* is so called *Psal.* cxlvii. 18. *Quæst.* 8. in *Gen.* Edit. *Sirmond.* Paris. 1642.

4 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

of the Air, or Atmosphere, or *Firmament*, as the *Greek* Version has it, God called *Heaven*, *ŷ* 8.

But though a great Quantity of Water was carried up and lodged in the new formed Atmosphere, yet the Earth was still all under Water; and whilst it continued so, it could not be a fit Habitation for the various Kinds of Creatures which were to be made. Therefore God, by his Almighty Spirit or Wind, made the Waters flee (as the Psalmist elegantly expresses it, *Pf.* civ. 7, 8) and run together into the Places and Channels appointed for them, both upon and under the Earth (*Pf.* xxxiii. 7.) which was now raised above them and became *dry Land*. The Earth being dry, immediately brought forth Grass and Herbs yielding Seed, and Fruit-trees of several Kinds bearing Fruit which had its Seed within it; and this was the Work of the third Day's Creation, *ŷ* 13.

The Earth was now made dry and habitable, and furnished with Grass, Herbs, and Fruits, which were proper for the Sustenance of living Animals; and had also, in the Atmosphere above, which surrounded it, a plentiful Reservoir of Water to refresh it when it wanted Moisture; but yet it was unable to bring its Fruits to Perfection without the Influence and Heat of the Sun, which in the fourth Day it had the full Benefit of. For now the chaotic Atmosphere being by the Spirit or Wind of God cleared of all its gross and noxious Vapours (which might be quite dissipated and spent by the Thunderings mentioned by the Psalmist in the third Day's Creation, *Pf.* civ. 7.) the Sun broke out in full Splendor, and enlightened and cherished the whole Earth with its Rays; and the Moon supplied his Place in the Evening, rising in the Fullness of her Majesty and Glory. These two great Lights appeared in the Firmament of Heaven, and alternately enlightened the whole Earth on the fourth Day of the Creation. And as God is said to have appointed them *to rule the Day and Night*, and to be for *Signs and Seasons*, and for *Days and Years*, it is, I think, probable, that they now took Possession of their Government by the annual Motion given to the Earth (which was for ever after to be supported and directed by the gravitating Power of the Sun) and by the menstrual Motion of the
Moon

Moon about the Earth at the same Time. This was the Work of the fourth Day's Creation, *ŷ* 14 — 19. (3)

It is said, *ŷ* 16. *God made two great Lights, viz. the Sun and Moon:* and it is certain that the Earth was by God's almighty Power so situated with respect to the Position of the Sun and Moon, that they might have their proper Influences over it; and so with Propriety be said to have been now made to rule over it. They now became properly a Sun and Moon to the Earth, whether they were then created when they first shone upon it, or before.

The *Hebrew* Word *Afa* or *Afe* (עשה) rendered to *make*, signifies also to *constitute*, or *appoint*, or *prepare*: and so it may mean that God appointed two great Lights, the one to rule over the Day, and the other to rule over the Night; or it may mean that God *had made* these two great Luminaries, which at the Creation of this Heaven and Earth he appointed to give Light, the one by Day, the other by Night. And it is evident that the Word may be taken in the præterpluperfect Tense, as it is in the 31st Verse, where it is rightly render'd, *God saw every Thing that he had made.*

Therefore, though it is undoubtedly true that God made or created the *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars*, yet there is no need to understand that they are any Part of the *Mosaic* Creation, which comprehended only the Heaven and the Earth; or the Earth with its Firmament or Atmosphere, which is called *Heaven*: but that they were made before, and the Earth so situated by divine Appointment that they might give Light to it, and regulate the *Seasons*, *Days*, and *Years* of the new-formed World: and also to be *Signs* or (4) Tokens of Vicissitudes and

(3) *Plutarch* has a fine Expression from *Plato*, to the Purpose: ὁ Πλάτων φησιν. ὅτι τῷ κόσμῳ ἡγομένην καὶ κινηθείη ἢ πρῶτην κίνησιν εὐφρανθῆναι τὸ θεόν. *Vit. Lycurg.* p. 57. *Plato* saies, that, when the World was made and received its first Motion, God was pleased; agreeably to *Moses* saying, *God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good.* *Gen.* i. 31.

(4) *Aratus* saies, concerning the heavenly Bodies,

Αὐτὸς γὰρ τάγε (ἡμᾶς) ἐν ἑσπέρῳ ἐσήειξε. *Phænom.* init.

They were also Signs, whereby Men were to be directed in Tillage, in planting, sowing, ordering and gathering the Fruits of the Earth. It appears also, that the Sun originally moved through the Ecliptic; for had it moved only in the Equator there could have been no Difference of Seasons.

6 Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.

Changes in the Earth. If the Earth as well as its Moon existed before the Mosaic Creation, they might have had other Directions in a prior State: and their present Orbits and Situation, with respect to each other and to the Sun, might be appointed at the new Creation or Formation of the Heaven and Earth. And the Words of the 14th Verse may be render'd, *Let the Lights which are in the Firmament of the Heaven be to divide the Day from the Night: and let them be for Signs and Seasons, and for Days and Years.*

But although the Creation of the Sun, Moon, and Stars be allowed to be no Part of the *Mosaic* Creation of our Heaven and Earth, that is, the Earth and its circumambient Atmosphere frequently called *Heaven* in the Style of Scripture and all ancient Books; and expressly so called by *Moses*, who calls by the Name of *Heaven* the Firmament which was stretched out above the Earth, and interposed between the Waters on the Earth and those in the upper Regions of the Air, *ŷ* 7, 8. yet it was proper and even necessary to take particular Notice of these celestial Luminaries, both as they were of so great Benefit to the Earth; and especially also to inform the *Jews* that these likewise were the Work of God, as much as this lower Earth was; and the mere Instruments of his Providence in the Ends and Uses for which they were made by him: And therefore were no more the Objects of Adoration and Worship, as the Heathens then generally and almost universally made them, than the Earth itself was: And that God only who made the Heaven and the Earth and the whole visible System of Beings, on whom they all equally depended, was to be worshiped by them. They were taught in this History of the Creation, that the Sun, Moon and Stars the most adored Deities of the ignorant and deluded heathen Nations were made by God for the Service of the Earth and of the Inhabitants of it. This was sufficient to let them see the Folly and Impiety of worshiping these Creatures of God instead of the Creator and Lord of all things.

Whether we consider the Earth as newly created by God's Power out of Nothing; or as new formed only from a Chaotic State or ruined World, we must, I think, in Reason conclude that its present Situation and Orbit in the solar System was appointed either on the first or fourth Day of the Creation.

As

As all Things were originally created out of Nothing (5), and it is highly probable that God hath always exercised his eternal Power and

(5) The ancient Pagan Philosophers universally agreed that Nothing was or could be created out of Nothing; but that whether the World was eternal or made in Time, the *Hyle* or original primary *Matter* of Things was eternal and self-existent. They thought the eternal self-existent *Hyle* first *Matter* or *Origine* of Things [which they distinguished from *Ufia*, Substance endued with Properties] was a meer Substratum without Form or any Qualities belonging to it, which is an evident Absurdity and Contradiction: and they did not consider that supposing it possible for such an *Hyle* or primary Matter to have always and necessarily existed, it was not possible for its State to be changed, or that any Form or Qualities should be superadded to it; and so, that no Power could create a World out of it, whether in Time or from Eternity. They notwithstanding supposed that God who was of a superior and distinct underived Nature created by his Power the Qualities or Properties of all Things, though he could not create the original *Hyle* or Matter which sustained them: By which Reasoning they connected created Properties with uncreated Matter, which is an evident Contradiction. For it is self-evident, that whatever is necessarily existent or un-originated must be immutable, and is necessarily only what it always was, and cannot be altered from what it was, or undergo any new Mode of Existence, or have any Properties or Qualities superadded to it: So that an un-originated *Hyle* or primary Matter must be independent of God, and not subject to his Power or Providence. Thus God's creating and governing Power of the Universe was absolutely excluded. But this Consequence they did not see, though it be really intuitive. Another Absurdity was the supposing two un-originated and necessarily-existent Beings of such infinitely different Natures as God and the *Hyle* to exist: The one endued with all Perfections, and the other absolutely imperfect and next to a *meer Nothing*. Hence it demonstratively follows that all Things must have been originally made or created by God *out of Nothing*, or from Non-Existence were made to exist by his Power and Will. And though it is impossible for us or, I suppose, any Creature to conceive the Manner of such Creation, yet it is as impossible not to suppose the Thing itself or such a creative Power, every other Supposition being an evident Absurdity and Contradiction: And Production of Beings from Non-existence is a necessary Consequence of the Agency of God and Exertion of his Power; and this Power and Agency necessarily belongs to the Nature of God: And therefore the very Supposition of a supreme un-originated intelligent Agent, Being, or God [whose Existence is strictly demonstrable] implies a creative Power. Thus far we can go upon demonstrative Principles and Evidence of *Reason*: but *Revelation* alone can inform us that God the supreme un-originated Agent made or created all

Wisdom

8 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

Wisdom in the Production of Beings; so it is easy to conceive that amongst the numberless Systems of created Beings which are existent and may have always existed in the infinite Space, there is and always was Room or Space to receive any new Systems of Beings which he should please either to create or new form. We know that in the present solar System some of its Parts or Planets are more compounded than others: The Earth has a Moon attending and depending upon her; and *Jupiter* and *Saturn* have their several Moons or Satellites. Others, as *Mars* and *Venus*, have no Moons that we know of; but may have without any Disorder in the entire System or their particular Orbits. And in the Space between the outmost Orbits of the solar System and the fixed Stars, as well as between one fixed Star and another, there is Room for numberless Orbits and Systems of Worlds which we know nothing of either already created and existing, or which may be created and exist whenever the omnipotent and all-wise Maker of all Things shall think fit to create them.

It is also rational to think that all the created Systems of Beings in the Universe had originally their several Periods of Duration assigned by divine Providence; and that they have undergone and will undergo Changes, Mutations, and Renovations according to the eternal Purpose of divine Wisdom, and to answer the Designs of God's All-comprehensive and All-governing Providence.

And if the Chaotic State of our Earth was not its first Creation, but only the Dissolution of a former State whose Period was determined in order to a new Formation of a different System; the Angels so called in Scripture might be the Inhabitants of the præexistent Orb or Globe now called the Earth; who having finished their Time of Trial and Probation were removed into other Habitations; the obedient and good Spirits into purer celestial Mansions; and the disobedient and evil Spirits into the dark Abyss and lower Regions of the Air to which they are confined: and we seem to have taken their Abodes on the Earth,

Things by another divine Person called in Scripture his *Logos* or *Word*, who acted by the *Power* and *Will* of the supreme un-originated Being in the Formation of the World.

new formed and made a suitable Habitation for us who are to have our Portion with them in the future State. And this will account for the Disposition of Angels in Relation to us, who are ministring Spirits and Dispensers of the divine Providence in the several Kingdoms of the Earth, which were put under their Jurisdiction when God *divided the Nations* at the separation of the Descendants of *Noah*, as *Moses* relates *Deut. xxxii. 8.* where the ancient and true Reading is, *He set the Bounds of the People (or Nations) according to the Number of the Sons of God,* and not *the Sons (or Children) of Israel*, as the present *Hebrew Text* reads, which has no Sense. Thus the wise Son of *Sirach* understood it, saying *Ecclus. xvii. 17. In the Division of the Nations of the whole Earth, He (God) set a Ruler over every People, but Israel is the Lord's Portion,* who conducted them by an Angel, as we read through all their History. The seventy Interpreters, as they are commonly called, of the Law of *Moses*, had in their *Hebrew Copy Bene el, Sons of God*, by which understanding *Angels*, they render'd the Words, *Angels of God.* And this Interpretation was received by the ancient *Jews*, as well as by all the primitive Christians both of the *Greek* and *Latin Church.* The Angels are call'd *Sons of God* twice in the Book of *Job. ch. i. 6. ch. xxxviii. 7.* These are styled the Archons or Princes of their several Countries *Dan. x. 12. and xii. 1. also, x. 21. and by St. John* more expressly, *Angels*, where, in his Revelations *ch. xii. 7, &c.* the Devil called the *Dragon* and his Angels are represented as warring against *Michael* and his Angels, each at the Head of their angelic Hosts, about the Establishment of the Christian Church in the *Roman Empire.* This Matter I have largely treated of in my Notes on *Novatian*, p. 133. to which I refer the learned Reader. And as this Opinion of subordinate Deities or Angels (6) being Presidents of the several Na-

(6) *Jamblicus* speaks the general Opinion of the *Egyptian* and other Nations: "Αγγελοι πάλαι αὐτῶν [Θεῶν] πανπληθεῖς ὑπάρχουσι. Καθ' ἑκάστου τε ἔθνους ἑστὶν ἑνὶ γένει ἀρεκλήρωται τις ὑπὸ αὐτῶν κρινὸς προσάτης. *De Myster. Sect. v. c. 25.* And *Origen* alluding to the Text of *Deut. xxxii. 8.* observes, that not only the *Egyptian*, but other Pagan History had the Account of the several Nations of the Earth being divided and distributed amongst those they call'd their Gods. *Cont. Cels. lib. v. p. 249, 250.*

tions of the Earth was generally received amongst the Pagans, it was probably derived from the first Patriarchs and Descendants of *Noah*. This Notion also gives Light to the Ministry of good Angels on the one Hand, appointed by God to watch over and to be Guardians of holy and pious Men (who in Scripture are said to be *Heirs of Salvation*) during their mortal State, and to conduct their Souls at Death into the Mansions of Happiness appointed for them: And likewise to the Temptations of bad Angels on the other Hand, who are permitted by the unfearchable Counsel of God to seduce, delude, and incite to commit Sin, those who leave the Paths of Religion and Virtue and indulge unreasonable and vicious Appetites and Passions; and at Death carry their Souls into the dismal Regions allotted to them, where they are reserv'd to the Day of Judgment and future Condemnation. This also farther illustrates the Scene of the Happiness of good Men in the future State, represented by their being made *like unto the Angels*, and associated with them; and of the future Misery and Punishment of the Wicked by their being tormented with the *Devil and his Angels* (7).

(7) *Plato*, in the Person of *Socrates*, represents the ancient Opinion of the Ministration of Angels (whom he calls *Dæmons*) in the future Judgment and the Happiness and Misery of Men, in a very elegant Manner, and agreeable to the Scripture-Representation of them, λέγει δὲ ἕτως· ὡς ἄρα τελευτήσασθα ἕκαστος ὁ ἐκάστου δαίμονος ὥσπερ [lege ὥσπερ] ζῶντα εἰλήχει, ἕτερον ἄγειν ὁππότε εἰς δὴ τινα τόπον, οἱ δὲ τὰς συλλεγένης διαδικασαμένοις εἰς ἄρα πορεύεσθαι μὲν ἡγεμόντος ἐκείνου ὃ δὴ προσέτακε τὰς ἐνθένδε ἐκείσε πορεύσασθαι. τυχεύσας ἢ ἐκείνῳ ὡν δὲ τυχεύῃ, ἢ μείνας ὃν χρόνον, ἄλλος δὲυρο πάλιν ἡγεμὼν κομίζῃ ἐν ποταμῷ χρόνῳ ἢ μακρῷς ἀφείδῃ. *Phæd.* p. 80. It is said that at Death every one's *Dæmon* (or *Angel*) who had the Care of him when alive, is ready to conduct him to an appointed Place, where they are gathered together who are to be judged, and after Judgment go to Hades along with a Conductor, who is commanded to bring them thither: where having received their due *Recompence*, and stayed their appointed Time, another Conductor brings them thither again after many long Circuits of Time. After he tells what he calls a beautiful though fabulous Representation of the future State both of Happiness and Misery. He then describes the *new Heavens and Earth* or the Habitation of the blessed, which abound in Gold and Silver, and precious Stones, as the *Sardine*, *Jasper*, *Emerald*, &c. [compare *Rev.* xxi. 19, 20.] and such a Temperature of Air and Climate as preserves the Inhabi-

But

But to proceed with the *Mosaic* History of the Creation.

The inanimate Creation being finished, and the Earth prepared for the Habitation of Creatures endued with Life; *Moses* relates in Order the several Kinds of them, *Fishes* and (8) *Fowls*, which the Waters and Earth brought forth on the fifth Day, *Gen.* i. ver. 20 — 23. After these were produced the various Kinds of Land Animals; and last of all (9) Man and Woman were created, to whom God gave Dominion over the rest of the Creatures, they being of a superior Nature to these, and endued with Reason and Understanding, which the others had not,

tants free from Diseases, and in a long Continuance of Health and Vigour, and Quickness of Sense and Understanding far superior to what Men have in this Life: and also that in this Place Men live and converse with the Gods in their Groves and Temples. He next describes the Place of the Wicked to be a great and deep subterraneous Gulf, abounding with Torrents of Mud and Filth, and Rivers of Fire, which he calls Rivers of *Tartarus*; into these the Wicked, after Death are thrown, and tormented for a longer or a shorter Time, according to their Guilt, and then set at Liberty: and they who have been enormously wicked lie for ever in *Tartarus*. He concludes that though what he had related was not to be understood literally, yet something analogous would befall the Soul in the future State. p. 82, 83, 84.

(8) In our Translation of the 20th Verse of the first Chapter of *Genesis*, the Words imply that the *Fowls* were produced out of the Waters as well as the *Fishes* viz. *And God said, Let the Waters bring forth abundantly the moving Creature that hath Life, and Fowl that may flie above the Earth in the open Firmament of Heaven.* From this Translation several learned Commentators have thought that *Fowls* were created out of Water: but it is said ch. ii. ver. 19. *And out of the Ground the Lord God formed every Beast of the Field, and every Fowl of the Air, &c.* Hence it appears that the *Fowls* were not created out of the *Water*, but out of the *Ground*, as the *Beasts* were. And this indeed is the Sense of the *Hebrew* Text in Ch. i. ver. 20; and it should have been render'd; *And let the Fowl flie above the Earth.* And thus it is both in the *Samaritan Hebrew* Text, and in the *Syriac* Version. So that the *LXX* Interpreters and the other *Greek* Translators took the Word *Jeophiph* for a Participle instead of a Verb; or else we must suppose in all their Versions the Word *ἔσω* to be understood, viz. *πείπειν* [*ἔσω*] *πείσονται*, as the *Septuagint*, or *πείπειν* [*ἔσω*] *πείσονται* or *πείσονται* as *Aquila*, *Theodotion*, and *Symmachus* render it.

(9) It appears from the ingenious Parable of *Protagoras* in *Plato* that it was a very ancient Opinion that Man was last created after the other living Creatures. *Plat. Protag.* p 320, 321. *Serrian.*

and by which they were able to rule and keep them in Subjection.

They are therefore said to be created *in the Likeness and Image of God* on Account of the intellectual Faculties of their active rational Soul which resemble the divine Perfections. Their Soul was not formed out of the Waters or Earth as the other living Creatures were, but was breathed into them immediately by God, (Ch. ii. 7.) and now the Creation was finished on the sixth Day, ver. 24, 31. (10) And the following or seventh Day was *sanctified* by God, (Ch. ii. 3.) to be a Memorial of the Works of his Creation; and this is a Reason for keeping this Day *holy*, to worship and praise God for the Works of his Creation and Providence that is immutably obligatory to all Mankind who have, or shall receive, the Knowledge of it, so long as the World shall endure, and till the Heavens and Earth shall be no more.

The *Mosaic* History of the Creation and the Patriarchal Genealogies following to the universal Deluge, was not any Revelation peculiarly delivered to *Moses*, but was known long before his Time, and from the Beginning to *Adam* and his Descendants before the Flood, and to *Noah* and his Family after the Flood; and was propagated in *Chaldaea*, *Phœnicia*, and *Egypt*, and from these Countries amongst the ancient *Greeks* and other Nations.

The Remains of the oldest *Chaldaean* Accounts of the Creation (corrupted and imperfect as they were) are preserved in *Georgius Syncellus* from *Alexander Polyhistor*, who took them from *Berosus*, who was Priest of *Belus* at *Babylon*, and lived in the Time of *Alexander the Great*. He related from the ancient *Babylonian* Records, that *Oannes*, the most ancient *Chaldaean* Sea-God taught the Use of Letters before the Flood, and wrote concerning the Origine of Things. He (11) said

(10) In *Gen.* ii. 2. it is said; *On the seventh Day God ended his Work*, &c. This is the Reading of the *Hebrew*, *Vulgate*, and *Chaldee* Paraphrase, but it is undoubtedly wrong; and ought to be read *on the sixth Day*, as it is in the *Samaritan Hebrew* Copy, and in the *Septuagint*, and in the *Syriac*, and *Josephus*, and *Philo Judæus*; and this Reading is confirmed from Ch. i. v. 31.

(11) Γεῖεθ' ὅτι χρίεν ἐν ᾧ τὸ πᾶν σκότος καὶ ὕδωρ εἶναι — ἔτις ἡ τῶν ὅλων συνεστάντων ἐπαρελθόντα Βῆλον χρίσαι τὴν γυνᾶκα μέσσην, καὶ τὸ μὲν ἑμῖσι ἀνῆλθε ποιῆσαι γυνῶν,
“ there

“ There was a Time when all Things were *Darkness* and *Water*” (this was the *Mosaic* Chaos) this Chaos consisting of *Darkness* and *Water* he allegorically represented as a “ Woman whom (12) *Belus* (*Baal* or *God*) divided into two Parts ; and of one Part made the Earth, and of the other the Heaven : the Meaning of which was, that *Belus* (their *Jupiter* or *Jehova*) by dividing the *Darkness* separated the Earth from the Heaven and formed the World into Order.”

He added, “ That after the Formation of Beasts, Birds, and Men, *Belus* perfected the Formation of the Stars, and the Sun and Moon, and the other five Planets.” This Relation is so far agreeable to the History of Scripture, but mixed with Fable. After this *Syncellus* gives an Account both from *Alexander* and *Abydenus* out of *Berosus* of the universal Deluge which agrees very nearly to the History of Scripture, as I shall have Occasion to observe in another Place. The ancient *Phœnicians* had their Account of the Creation and first Ages of the World from *Taaut* the Grandson of *Ham*, which was published in the *Phœnician* Language, by *Sanchoiatho* Priest of *Berytus* before the Time of the *Trojan* War, and out of the Temple Records of *Berytus* or *Tyre*. This Account is preserved in the *Præparatio Evangelica* of *Eusebius* from *Philo* of *Byblus* who translated it into *Greek*.

Sanchoiatho related from the Annals of *Taaut*, that the Principle or primary Matter of the Universe was “ A dark and windy or spirituous Air, (13) and a gloomy confused Chaos: that these were

τὸ ὃ ἄλλο ἡμῖς ἐρανόν. — ἀπηγορευτικῶς ὃ Φησὶν τῷ μὲν Φυσιολογῆσαι — τὸ ὃ Βῆλον ὃν Δία μεθερμωδύσει μέσον τεμνίλα τὸ σκότος χωρίσαι γλῶττὴν καὶ ἐρανόν ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων καὶ διατάξαι τὸν κόσμον — ἀπειλέσαι ὃ τὸν Βῆλον καὶ αἶρα καὶ ἥλιον καὶ σελλιών καὶ τὰς πέντε πλανήτας. *Chronograph.* p. 29, 30,

(12) He calls the Woman *Omoroca*, which in the *Chaldee* Language was *Thalath*, and in the *Greek* signified *Sea*; ἀρχὴ ὃ τέτων πάντων γυνή ἢ ὄνομα Ομορώκα, εἶναι ὃ τῷ χαλδαῖσι μὲν Θαλάτθ, Ἑλληνιστὶ ὃ μεθερμωδύει Ὁάλασσα. *ibid.* The Place is corrupt, see *Voss. de Septuagint. Interpret.* p. 409, 410.

(13) Τὴν τὴν ὅλων ἀρχὴν ὑποτιθεῖ αἶρα ζοφώδη καὶ πνέματιώδη ἢ πνοὴν αἶρα ζοφώδης, καὶ χάσας θολερὸν ἐρεβώδες. ταῦτα ὃ εἶναι ἀπειρα καὶ ἀπὸ πολλὸν αἰῶνα μὴ ἔχειν πέρας. ὅτε ὃ, Φησὶν, ἡρώδη τὸ πνέμα τὸ ἰδίον ἀρχῶν καὶ ἐγένετο σύγκρησις, ἢ πλοκή ἐκείνη ἐκλήθη πόθος, αὐτὴ ὃ ἀρχὴ κτίσεως ἀπάντων. — Καὶ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς συμπλοκῆς τῶ πνέματι ἐγένετο Μῶτ. τῷ τινὲς φασὶν ἰλιώ. οἱ ὃ ὑδατώδης μίξεως σήψιν. Καὶ ἐκ ταύτης ἐγένετο πᾶσα σπορὰ κτίσεως καὶ γένεσις τῶ ὅλων. ἦν δὲ τινα ζῶα σὰν ἔχοντα αἶσ-

“ boundless,

“ boundless, and for a long Duration had no Bounds set to them ;
 “ but when the windy or spirituous Substance became enamoured
 “ with its own Principles, and a Mixture was thereby made, that
 “ Conjunction was called *Desire* (14) (Love) which was the Principle
 “ of the Creation of all Things. From the Copulation of Spirit or
 “ Wind (with Love or Desire) a Substance was produc’d call’d *Mot*,
 “ which some called *Mud*, and others a watry fermented Mixture,
 “ from which the Seed was formed whence the Universe was gene-
 “ rated. Some Animals were formed which had no Sensation (or
 “ Life) and from these were produced sensible Animals in the Form
 “ of an Egg, (lying in an oval Form in the Fœtus) which were called
 “ *Zophasemin*, that is, *Contemplators of Heaven*.” I suspect the Word
Zophasemin is not rightly render’d *Contemplators of Heaven*: For the
Phœnicians call’d *Heaven*, *Samen* or *Samin*, as is afterwards observed by
Philo; and these Animals being presently after said to be *roused with*
the Noise of Thunder, and to move in the Water and on the Earth, Male
and Female, they were no other than *Fishes and Beasts*; and could not
 without Absurdity be called *Contemplators of Heaven*, as if they were
 rational Creatures, which were not yet formed. So the Word, I think,
 must mean something else.

ἐκ τούτων, ἐξ ὧν ἐγένετο ζῶα νεφελά, καὶ ἐκλάβη Ζωφασεμιν, τῶν ἐν ἐρατῇ καὶ ἐπιπύ, ἢ ἀνε-
 πλάσθη ὁμοίως ὡς γήματι. lib. i. c. 10. p. 33.

(14) *Philo* has render’d the *Phœnician* Word by πῶς, but perhaps the
 Word was תבואה *ieba*, and should have been render’d by ἐρως *Love*, and it
 is well known that in the *Orphic* Cosmogony, which is as old as *Sanchoniatho*
 and was follow’d by *Hesiod*, and the oldest Philosophers, *Parmenides*, *Empe-
 docles*, *Plato*, and others, *Love* was esteemed the first and most ancient Deity,
 and the harmonious Principle of the whole Creation. Therefore the *Orphic*
Argonautic Poem calls *Love*, πρεσβύτατον τε καὶ αὐδέη περὶ μὲν ἐρατα, § 422. So
 likewise *Pluto* in *Comit.* p. 1178. and *Plutarch* explains the Sense of *Hesiod*.
 Ἡσιόδῳ δὲ θυσιαώτερον ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ ποιεῖν ἐρωτα παλίων πρεσβύτατον, ἵνα πάλαι δι’ ἐκεί-
 νου [i. ἐκείνης] μέλας γενέσθαι *Anactor*. p. 756. And he has a beautiful Passage
 in his Treatise *De Facie in Orbe Luna*, where he represents it to be the Opi-
 nion of *Empedocles*, *Parmenides*, and *Hesiod*, that the World at first consisted
 of Principles which had no Connection or Agreement or Tendency to Con-
 junction, Order, and Harmony, till *divine Providence infused into Nature the*
amiable and desirable Principle of Conjunction and Love p. 926. By this they
 seem to have meant the Principle of mutual Attraction or Gravitation, by
 which the whole Universe is preserved and supported.

Sanchoniatbo added; (15) “The *Mot* sent forth Light, and the Sun, “Moon, and Stars shone in their Orbs.” And having mentioned the Names of the Winds, he said, (16) that “of the Wind *Colpia* and “his Wife *Baau*, interpreted *Night*, two Mortals were begot, called “*Protogonus* (*i. e.* first-born) and *Æon* (*i. e.* Life.)” These were *Adam* and *Eve*, the first Parents of Mankind.

This Description of the Cosmogony by *Sanchoniatbo* was the Foundation of what *Orpheus*, *Hesiod*, and other Greek Poets and Philosophers wrote about it.

Orpheus taught (17) “that in the Beginning God created an *Æther* “which was inveloped on every side by a Chaos: and gloomy Night

(15) ἐξέλαμψε Μῶτ, ἥλιός τε καὶ σελήνη, ἀστέρες τε — εἰτά φησι γεννηθῆναι ἐκ τῆς Κολπίας ἀνέμῳ καὶ γυναικὶ αὐτῆς Βάαυ, τῆτο δὲ νύκτα ἐρμολογέειν, Αἰῶνα καὶ πρωτόγονον ἀνθρώπου ὅτι καλεσμένους. p. 33, 34.

I question whether *Philo* has rightly rendered the word Μῶτ by *Mud*; or whether the Word was not Μῶτ or Μῶθ, which *Plutarch* tells us was the Egyptian Name or Surname of *Isis*, and signified *Mother*: for she was allegorically *the Mother of all Things* and *universal Nature*; and this Sense is more suitable to its being said that from this Μῶτ, or Μῶτ, *the Seed was formed from which the Universe was generated*. This is very agreeable to the Egyptian mysterious Name of *Isis*, *Mout*, as being prolific generative Nature and *Mother* of all Things.

(16) *Sanchoniatbo* might mean by the Wind *Colpia* (wrote probably *Kol-Pi-Jab*) *i. e.* the Voice of the Mouth of *Jehova*, as *Grotius* and *Bochart* understand it) the Spirit or Wind of God, mentioned by *Moses*, *Gen.* i. 2. For in all the ancient Accounts the Wind which impregnated the dark and confused Chaos, was thought to have a divine Energy in it. But I am not satisfied with the Criticism of *Bochart* (*Geog. Sac.* p. 706.) on the Word *Baau*, which he thinks should be read *Baaut*, and signifies *Night*, as being derived from *But*, which in the Syriac and Chaldee Languages is *pernoctare*. But he produceth no Instance of *Night* being called *Baaut*, nor is any such Word to be found in these Languages. *Philo* might well enough interpret *Baau*, *Emptiness* or *Vacuity*, by the Word *Night*.

(17) ἐξεθελόθη Ὁρφῶς ταῦτα, ὅτι ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀνεδείχθη ὁ αἰθήρ ὑπὸ [ὑπὸ Suid.] τῆς θεᾶς δημιουργοῦς καὶ ἐντεῦθεν κατέβηεν ὁ αἰθήρ ἢν χάος, καὶ νύξ ζοφερά πάντα κατέειχε καὶ ἐκάλυπτε τὸ ὑπὸ τῷ αἰθέρι. (ἡμαῖνων τῷ νύκτα προλεγεῖν [ita Suidas et Cedrenus, sed Malala habet προλεγεῖν male pro προλέγειν] εἰρηκῶς ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἐκδέσει, ἀκατάληπτον τινα καὶ πάντων ὑπέρλατον εἶναι, καὶ προχλύεσθαι δὲ [f. δὲ] καὶ δημιουργοῦ ἀπάντων καὶ τῷ αἰθέρι αὐτῇ καὶ τῷ νυκτὸς καὶ πάσης τῇ ὑπὸ τῷ αἰθέρι ὄψεως καὶ καλυπτομένης κλίσεως. τῷ δὲ γλῶσσει εἶπεν ὑπὸ τῷ (κόττος ἀόρατον ἔσαν· ἔφρασε δὲ, ὅτι τὸ φῶς ῥῆξαν τῷ αἰθέρι ἐφώτισε τῷ γλῶσσει καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν κλίσην. εἰπὼν ἐκεῖνο εἶναι τὸ φῶς τὸ ῥῆξαν “ cover’d

‘ covered all beneath the Æther, meaning that Night preceded the
 “ Creation of all Things. *Orpheus* added ; that the Æther, and
 “ Night, and all Things that were under the Æther and cover’d
 “ with Darkneſs, were made by a Creator who is eternal, incompre-
 “ henſible, and ſupreme over all. He ſaid, the Earth lay inviſible
 “ under the Darkneſs; but that Light breaking through the Æther,
 “ illuminated the Earth and the whole Creation. And this Light he
 “ explained to be him whom before he call’d Supreme over all; and
 “ whom he was taught by the Oracle to call *Wiſdom, Light, and*
 “ *Giver of Life.*” *Orpheus* related alſo the Formation of the Sun,
 “ Moon, and Stars, Earth and Sea ; and that Man was formed out
 “ of the Earth by God, and endued by him with a rational Soul.”

This remarkable Coſmogony aſcribed to *Orpheus* by *Timotheus* an ancient Chronologer, from whom *Cedrenus*, and *John Malala* of *Antioch*, and *Suidas* tranſcribed it, ſeems to be a Remain of the oldeſt Pagan Coſmogony, which *Orpheus* was taught in the Myſteries of *Egypt* and *Phœnicia* ; for *Suidas* ſaies he was inſtructed in many Myſteries : and the Account is agreeable to the *Mosaic* Hiſtory of the Creation, though related in a leſs clear, and more imperfect Manner. We may obſerve that *Orpheus* ſpeaks of an archetypal Light which broke through the Æther enveloped with the Chaos, which was precedent to the Formation of the Sun, Moon, and Stars. This was the Light mentioned by *Mofes*, *Gen.* i. 3. And *Plutarch* (18) tells us that *Empedocles* thought there were two Suns, one the Original, the

τὸ αἰθέρα τὸ προεργημένον, τὸ ὑπερφάνον πάντων ὃ ἐνομα ὁ αὐτὸς Ὀρφεὺς ἀνέσας ἐκ
 τῆς μαυρίας ἐξέπεε — Βελή, φῶς, ζωοποιός etc. *Joan. Malalæ Chronograph.* p.
 89, 90. *Cedren. Hiſt. Compend.* p. 46. *Suid. Voc.* Ὀρφεὺς. But it muſt
 be obſerved, that in the abovementioned Paſſage, the Edit. of *Suidas* after *δημι-
 ουργὸν ἀπαντων* corruptly hath πέν γε ὑπερφάνον αἰθέρα, inſtead of the true Read-
 ing πέν γε αἰθέρα αὐτὸν, which corrupt Reading intimates the Æther to be the
ſupreme Creator of all Things, and is accordingly rendered by the learned Edi-
 tor, ſummum ætherem rerum opificem : which ſenſe is directly contradictory
 both to what goes before [ὁ αἰθερὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ δημιουργηθεὶς] and alſo to what fol-
 lows [τὸ φῶς πρὸ ἧξεν τὸ αἰθέρα — ὑπερφάνον πάντων] and I wonder the learned
 Editor, who is *περίεικτος*, did not ſee this Corruption of the Text of *Suidas*.

(18) *Lib.* ii. de *Placit. Philoſ.* c. 20.

other

other that which we see: which seems to be an Allusion to the Orphic Light which dispelled the Chaos.

We have the oldest *Egyptian* Explanation of the Cosmogony in a Book entitled *Hermes Trismegistus*, in which it is said (19); "There was a boundless Darkness upon the Deep (or Abyss) and Water and an ætherial intelligent Spirit acted by divine Power on the Chaos; then an holy Light issued forth, and the Elements were compacted of the moist sandy substance, and all the Gods (*viz.* Angels or celestial Beings) distributed the feminine Principles of Things." And *Diodorus Siculus* (20) gives the old physical Account of the Formation of the World, and of Animals and Men, as all proceeding (according to the *Egyptians*) from a Chaos impregnated with Wind.

Orpheus carried the *Egyptian* and *Phœnician* Cosmogony with their Mysteries amongst the *Greeks*: and *Aristotle* (21) observes that the Theologers and natural Philosophers agreed that all things were produced, as the first said, *out of Night*, or, as the latter, *out of a confused Mixture*. Thus the most ancient *Greek* Poet *Linus*, the Master of *Orpheus*, is cited as teaching (22) *that there was a Time when all Things were mixed together*. And *Hesiod* mentions the Chaos as being prior to the Creation; and *Zeno* of *Cittium*, the Founder of the Stoics, said *Hesiod* meant by his Chaos, *Water*, (23) *out of which all things were formed, which draining off left Mud, which by Concretion became firm Earth*. And *Plutarch* saies most Writers understood it in like manner (tom. ii. p. 955.) *Anaxagoras* (24) taught that *all things were*

(19) ἦν χρότος ἄπειρον ἐν ἀβύσσῳ, καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ πνεῦμα λεπτὸν νοερόν διωάμεν θεία ὄντα ἐν χάρι. ἀνείθη ὃ φῶς ἅγιον καὶ ἐπάγη ὑπ' αἰμῶν ἐξ ὕλης ὁσίας σοιχεῖα καὶ θεοὶ πάντες καὶ αἰαδιαιρέσι φύσεως ἐκπύρεται. *Serm. Sac. c. 3. init.*

(20) *Biblioth. Lib. i. p. 7. Edit. Rhod.*

(21) Καὶ τοὺς λέγουσιν οἱ θεόλογοι οἱ ἐκ νυκτὸς γεννῶντες, καὶ ὡς οἱ φυσικοὶ, ἦν ὁμοῦ πάντα χεῖμαλα. *Metaphys. lib. xiv. c. 6.*

(22) ἦν πότε τοι χρότος ἔστι ἐν ᾧ ἅμα πάντα ἐπεφύκει.

(23) Ζῶων τὸ παρ' Ἡσιόδου χάτος ὕδωρ εἶναι φησιν, ἐξ ὃ τὰ πάντα γίνεσθαι. καὶ Ζωιζάνου ἰλιὸν γένεσθαι, ἢς πηλυμμένης ἡ γῆ σερεῖσθαι. *Schol. in Apollon. Rhod. Argonaut. iv. on the Words*

—— ἐξ ἰλίου ἐβλάστησε

χθὼν αὐτή.

(24) πάντα χεῖμαλα ἦν ὁμοῦ, εἶτα νῆς ἐλθὼν αὐτὰ διεκόσμησε. ap. *Diog. Laert.*

mixed together, and that Mind formed them into Order. The same is taught by *Plato* in his *Timæus*. And *Ovid's* elegant Description of the Creation, which is very agreeable to the Account of *Moses*, is known to all.

Suidas (25) mentions the History of an old *Tuscan* Writer, who represented the six Days Creation as so many thousand Years: and that in the first Chiliad God made the Heaven and Earth; in the second, the Firmament, calling it Heaven: in the third, the Sea and all the Waters that are on the Earth: in the fourth, the great Lights, the Sun and Moon, and also the Stars: in the fifth, every living Creature, of Fowls, creeping things, and Beasts, which inhabit the Air, Earth, and Water: in the sixth, he created Man. Whether this Account was taken from some ancient *Tuscan* Annals or Tradition, the *Tuscans* being one of the oldest People of *Italy*, and the first who had Letters amongst them, is not known: but it agrees so nearly with the History of *Moses* (except in the odd Fancy of putting Chiliads of Years for Days) that one would suspect it was either derived from it, or from some other original Account.

The *Mosaic* Computation of Days by *Evenings and Mornings* was used by the (26) *Athenians* and other Nations in ancient Times.

p. 34. and his Scholar *Euripides* wrote in his *Menalippe*, viz.

Ὡς ἔργον·ς τε γαῖα τ' ἦν μορφὴ μία·
Ἐπεὶ δ' ἐχωρίσθησαν ἀλλήλων δίχα,
τίκ' οἱ πάντα κατέδωκαν εἰς φάος
Δένδρη, πτεῖνα δ' θήρεσσιν, ἔς δ' ἄλμυ τρέφει
Γένε' τε θνητῶν.

But for κατέδωκαν, I would read καξέδωκαν, i. e. καὶ ἐξέδωκαν. And *Aristophanes*, in *Axibus*, p. 694. etc.

Χάος ἦν καὶ νύξ, Ἐρεβός τε μέλαν πρῶτον, καὶ Τάριαρ· εὐρύς·
Γῆ δ', ἔδ' αἴρ, ἔδ' ἔργον·ς ἦν· Ἐρεβός δ' ἐν ἀπείροσι κόλποις
Τικ' ἐπρώτιστον ὤπηνέμεον νύξ ἢ μελανόπτερος ὦν, etc.

The Greek Ἐρεβός was form'd from the *Hebrew* *Ereb*, Gen. i. 5. to express *Darkness*.

(25) Voce Τυφλωία.

(26) *Eos* (i. e. *Atheniensis*) a sole occaso ad solem iterum occidentem omne id medium tempus unum diem esse dicere. A. Gell. Noct. Attic. lib. iii. c. 2. p. 208.

The

The (27) *Druids* and ancient *Galli* and *Germans* reckoned Time in the same manner.

From the preceding, most ancient, recondite Accounts of the Creation amongst the *Phœnicians*, *Chaldæans*, and *Egyptians*, which were preserved and taught in their Mysteries, and derived from them to the *Greeks* and other Nations, it is evident that from the highest Antiquity the History of the Creation which *Moses* delivered to the *Jews*, was known among all the Descendants of *Noah*, and was originally founded on divine Revelation. It could not otherwise with Probability have happened, that the History of the Creation should be preserved and related in so nearly the same Manner, in the most ancient Mysteries of *Chaldæa*, *Phœnicia*, and *Egypt*, as *Moses* has related it. That a Notion should so universally prevail, that the *Matter* of the visible World was originally a dark and confused Mixture or Chaos; that a spiritual or divine Wind from God or the supreme Mind acted upon it, and by Degrees brought the Mass into Order: that Light issued out of the Chaos before the Sun and Moon were made, or shined in their Orbs: and that after the Formation of the Elements, and the Trees, and Herbs of the Earth, and the several Kinds of brute Animals, Fishes, and Fowls, and other living Creatures, Man and Woman were at last created.

That this History, in which the one supreme Mind or God was taught to be the Creator of all Things, should be mixed with Fable after Idolatry prevailed, is no Wonder. And therefore after the Worship of the Sun, Moon, Stars, and Planets supposed to be inhabited by celestial Dæmons and deified Heroes, was almost universally received, the *Chaldæan*, *Phœnician*, and *Egyptian* Priests and Philosophers taught the People that these were the first, eternal, and supreme Gods:

(27) Nec dierum numerum ut nos, sed noctium computant, sic constituent, sic condicunt: nox ducere diem videtur. Tacit. de Mor. German. and Cæsar relates of the *Druids* and *Galli*; Spatia omnis temporis non numero dierum sed noctium definiunt: et dies natales et mensium, et annorum initia sic observant, ut noctem dies subsequatur. The *Numidians* computed their Time in the same manner by Nights, which they probably learned from the *Phœnicians*. Οὐ γὰρ ἡμέρας ἀλλὰ γὰρ νύκτας αὐτῶν ἀριθμοῦσι τὸ χρόνον. Nic. Damascen. de Numidis.

and this Idolatry, at first set up by Kings and Ministers of State, was every where the popular and political Religion in (28) *Asia, Europe, and Africa*. But their secret Doctrine taught in their Mysteries was, that one supreme Mind or God filled the whole Universe with his Presence, Power, and Providence, and both formed and governed it: and that the celestial Luminaries, or Gods residing in them, were the subordinate Ministers of the divine Providence in the several Parts of the World; and symbolically represented the Properties, Perfections, and Power of the supreme Deity. So that they thought the supreme Mind or God to be *all in all*; and referred all the subordinate Deities to him as supreme Head; and resolved their Power and ministerial Government of the World into him, as being the Fountain of all Being, Power, and Perfection.

These were the secret *Hermetic* Doctrines of the *Egyptians*, as we learn from *Jamblicus* who had thoroughly studied the *Egyptian* Theology; and also from *Hermes Trismegistus* (29) who treats largely of the sacred *Egyptian* Doctrines concerning God, Providence, and the Formation of the World. And *Simplicius*, (30) who held with *Aristotle* the World's Eternity, affirms that the *Mosaic* History of the World's Creation by God was a fabulous Tradition derived from the *Egyptians*: and the Oracle of *Apollo* cited by *Eusebius* from (31) *Porphyry*, declared that the *Chaldeans* and *Hebrews* had the *true Knowledge of God, who worshiped in an holy Manner God the unoriginated Being*.

But to return to the History of *Moses*:

Adam the first Man, as soon as he was created, was placed by God in Paradise or the *Garden of Eden*, situated between the two famous Rivers called *Tigris* and *Euphrates* in *Babylonia* or the Land of *Shinar*, as is most probable, which extended on both Sides these Rivers. Here God had provided every Thing for him that *was pleasant to the Sight, and good for Food*. (*Gen. ii. 8, 9.*) and here it was that God revealed to

(28) See *Diod. Sic. lib. i. Init.* and *Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. iii. p. 87 — 103.*

(29) *Sermon. Sac. c. 3. and c. 5. and c. 16. fin. Edit. 4°. 1574.*

(30) *Comment. in Phys. Aristot. lib. viii.*

(31) *Præp. Evang. lib. ix. c. 10.*

him the History of the Creation, to afford him Matter for solemnizing the first (32) Sabbath or seventh Day's Rest in celebrating the Power and Goodness of his Maker, and paying suitable Adoration to him as the Author of his Being, for the Benefits of his Creation and Providence. God, at the same Time, inspired him with Language, and Knowledge of the Works which he had made for him; so that he was immediately able to give Names to the Fowls and Beasts which were presented before him, agreeable to the several Properties belonging to them: and as their Names were given to them by Inspiration from God, we must conclude that they were the most proper and suitable to their Natures that could be given them. Plato reflecting on this Subject saies, (33) *it is most true that a Power more than human gave the first Names to Things: so that we must needs think they were rightly given.*

Adam having viewed the several Kinds of Fowls and Beasts, and given Names to them, perceived that they were Male and Female, and could express by Sounds and Motions a mutual Benevolence and Affection for one another: but that they were all inferior in Nature to

(32) As the seventh Day *Sabbath* was instituted by God to preserve the Memory of the Creation, and was given to *Adam* for this Purpose; there can be no Doubt but it was religiously kept by him, and that he taught his Children and Descendants to keep it holy. And as the Reason of the Institution was always the same, the *Sabbath-Day* probably continued to be observed in all the Ages before the Flood by all the righteous Worshipers of God: and also after the Flood by *Noah* and his Family and their Descendants; from whom it was received by *Abraham* and transmitted from him to the *Israelites*: And it is evident that it was observed by the *Jews* before the Delivery of the Law, and was well known and had probably been kept by them in *Egypt*. See *Exod.* xvi. 5, 22--30. The Institution of the *Sabbath* being carried by the Descendants of *Noah* into all Countries whither they were dispersed, laid the Foundation every where of reckoning by *Weeks* or a Period of seven Days; and also of esteeming the seventh to be a sacred Day. But after Idolatry prevailed, and dead Men were worshiped instead of the true God, the *Sabbath* was laid aside, and by Degrees the Reason of its Institution was lost, and the Days of the Week were consecrated to the Planets and celestial Deities supposed to inhabit them.

(33) Οἷμαι μὲν ἐγὼ ἢ ἀληθείας λόγον πρὸς τῶν εἶναι, ὡς Σωκράτης, μείζω τινα δύναμιν εἶναι ἢ ἀνθρωπείαν ἢ θεμενίω τὰ πρῶτα ὀνόματα τοῖς πράγμασι ὥς ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι αὐτὰ ὁρθῶς ἔχειν. *Cratyl.* p. 300. Edit. *Ficin.*

him;

him; were deprived of Speech, and not made to be his Companions, so that his Condition, though superior to all the animal Creation, was solitary and imperfect 'till a suitable Companion was provided for him, to whom he might communicate his Knowledge and express his Love, which he saw prevailed amongst all the Kinds of living Creatures. God therefore immediately made for him a Comfort whom he might delight in: and whilst he lay fast asleep, his Senses wearied and Spirits exhausted (we may suppose) with the Variety of entertaining Objects they had been employed upon, God formed a Woman out of his Side of one of his Ribs, and brought and presented her to him, adorned with all the Beauty and Perfections both of Body and Mind. As soon as *Adam* saw her, he was inspired with the Sense of her Relation to him, and filled with the Love of her, and declared her to be the dear Companion of his Life; and called her Name *Woman*, and afterwards *Eve* or *Heve* which is the true Name, *Gen.* iii. 20. as knowing she was formed out of him and that she was to be the Mother of all the Race of Mankind.

How long the new created Pair continued in the Garden of *Eden*, we are not told. It seems to have been no longer than till *Eve* was capable of conceiving and being with Child; for they had no Children in Paradise, or before they transgressed in eating the Fruit of the forbidden Tree.

Some ancient *Jewish* Traditions contained in a Book called the *Small Genesis*, (34) relate that *Adam* and *Eve* lived seven Years in Paradise, and were ejected in the eighth Year. And this Account is not improbable.

It is a Question amongst Chronologers at what Time or Season of the Year the Earth was created, and the annual Motion of it commenced. Many are of Opinion that the first Year began at the Autumnal Equinox; others think it more probable that it began at the vernal Equinox; and some of the Ancients thought that it began at the Summer Solstice.

(34) Apud *Syncl. Chronograph.* p. 8. This Book was also call'd *Jubilee*. *Epiph. adv. Hæres.* lib. i. p. 287.

The *Egyptians* (and also as is probable the *Syrians*, *Phœnicians*, and *Canaanites*) began their Year originally at the Autumnal Equinox: for the *Egyptian* Month call'd *Tboth* was the first Month of their original Year, and commenced in the *Roman* Month *September*, and contained Part of *September* and Part of *October*. This the ancient and modern Chronologers all agree in. And that the Month called *Tboth* was the first of the Year is evident from their always placing the five intercalary Days which were added to the End of the Year, after it was found to have in it 365 Days, between the Month called *Mesori* answering to *August*, and *Tboth*: and they always called *September Tboth*, even after they reckoned the Year to begin at the *Heliacal* Rising of their *Sothis* or Dogstar, which was the Beginning of their canicular Year. But then, though the *Egyptians* began their ordinary Year at the Autumnal Equinox, and this was their original and most ancient Beginning of it, yet they thought that the World was created after the Summer Solstice when the Sun was in *Leo*: and this was owing to their superstitious Veneration of the *Sothis* or Dogstar, which they placed in that Constellation.

When the *Israelites* went into *Egypt*, and whilst they dwelt there, they used the *Egyptian* Year and reckoned by it, and ever after continued to begin their civil Year about the Autumnal Equinox in *Tisri*, which corresponded to Part of *September* and Part of *October*, as the *Egyptian Tboth* did. And though the sacred ecclesiastical Year by God's special Command to *Moses* began at the vernal Equinox in the Month *Abib* or *Nisan*, which was Part of *March* and Part of *April*; yet the *Sabbatical* and *Jubilean* Year still commenced at the Autumnal Equinox; and all their Deeds of Contracts, Purchase, and Sale, had a Reference to the civil Year only.

The *Attic Greeks* began their Year at or about the Summer Tropic or Solstice, or at the new Moon which was nearest to it. This is agreed by all. But *Scaliger* (35) thinks that they had two Beginnings of their Year; one and the oldest at the Winter Solstice, and the other at the Summer Tropic: But for this he has not the least Evidence or

(35) *Emendat. Temp.* p. 41. *Canon. Isagog.* lib. iii. p. 232. &c.

Foundation, and our learned Mr. *Dodwell* (36) following *Scaliger*, thinks that the Institution of the Year at the Summer Solstice, was occasioned by *Meton's* Cycle of nineteen lunar Years which took its Epoch from that cardinal Point of the Year. But this learned Chronologer does not bring any direct Testimony to shew that the *Athenian* Year ever began at the Winter Solstice: and *Meton* probably made the Epoch of his lunar Cycle commence at the same Time with the ancient solar Year. This is more natural to suppose than that any Change was made in the Year. *Meton* corrected the *Athenian* Months which were lunar; and by his Cycle brought them as near as he could to the same cardinal Points in a Period of nineteen Years; and by proper Intercalations to the same Point of the Zodiac with the Sun also. But still the civil solar Year commenced always at the Summer Solstice or at the new Moon which was nearest to it, and sometimes preceded and sometimes followed it.

The best Argument which *Scaliger* and *Dodwell* have for the Winter Solstice being the Beginning of the old *Attic* Year, is, that the intercalary Month was a second *Posideon*, which was *December*; and all intercalary Months or Days were added at the End of the Year.

It is true, we find a first and second *Posideon* in a very antient *Athenian* Inscription, which (37) *Spon* published from *Wheeler*; and a first *Posideon* is mentioned by (38) *Ptolemy*: but this was either peculiar to the *Attic* lunar Cycle, which might begin at the Winter Solstice, or else the *Greeks* placed the intercalary lunar Month in the middle of the Year, because they had an Intercalation of five Days (after they knew the Year consisted of 365 Days, which they learned from the *Egyptians*) at the End of the solar Year in the Summer Tropic. So this is no Proof of the *Attic* solar Year having ever begun at the Winter Solstice. And it does not appear that the *Greeks* intercalated their Months at the End of the Year, but only the (39) five Days Surplus of the old solar Year.

(36) *Differt. 1^a. De vet. Cyclis.*

(37) *De Pag. Attic. p. 5. ad fin. Meursi. Thef.*

(38) *Magn. Construct. lib. iv. p. 106.*

(39) *Illi (Græci) ultimo anni sui mensi superfluos interferebant dies, ut*
It

It is, I think, sufficiently evident that the old *Attic* Year began about the Summer Tropic, before the Cycle of *Meton* and *Euclemon* was known. *Thucydides* saies (40) the *Peloponnesian* War began in the Beginning of Spring, when *Pythodorus* had two Months to continue *Archon*: that is, before the chusing of a new one, which was always at the Beginning of the Year. Therefore *Plato* (41) represents *Socrates* commanding all the Magistrates to meet the Day before the Beginning of the new Year, just after the Summer Tropic. Now as *Thucydides* and *Socrates* both lived before the *Metonic* Cycle was instituted, they must refer to the old civil Year, and not to that which is supposed to have been reformed and instituted after this new Cycle was made by *Meton* and *Euclemon*, the Year before the *Peloponnesian* War began. Had any Alteration been then made in the Commencement of the solar Year, it must have been known to *Thucydides* and *Plato*; and they could not, in speaking of Times contemporary with this Alteration, have avoided taking Notice of it, had the Commencement of the Year they speak of been then newly instituted. We may therefore with Certainty conclude that the solar Year of the *Athenians* did not by a new Institution commence at or about the Summer Solstice, when *Meton* made his Lunar Cycle; but was the old Civil Year, always reckoned from that Solstice.

The *Chaldaeans* and *Babylonians* who were the most ancient People, and from whose Country the first Inhabitants of the World after the

refert Glaucippus, qui de sacris Atheniensium scribit. *A. Macrob. Saturnal.* lib. i. cap. 13.

(40) Πυθοδώρς ἔτι δύο μῶνας ἀρχοῖτο Ἀθλωαίοις, — ἢ ἅμα ἤει δρχομῶν. lib. ii. init. p. 98. Edit. Duker. The words are corruptly cited by *Petavius*, Πυθοδώρς ἀρχοῖτο [pro ἄρχοῖτο] ἔτι δύο μῶνας. Doct. temp. lib. i. c. 12. The old Scholiast explains them, τρεῖς δέκα μῶνας. Καὶ ἐνιαυτὸν γὰρ ἠλλάσσοντο. in loc. *Thucyd.*

(41) ἐπειδὴν μέλλῃ ἐνέει ἐνιαυτὸς μετὰ τὰς θερινὰς τροπὰς τῷ ὀπίοντι μῶνι γινέσθαι. *De Leg.* lib. 6. — Theodore Gaza (lib. de Mensibus) saies; καὶ Ἀθλωαῖοι τὸ ἐνιαυτὸν ἤρχοντο ἀπὸ ἐκατομβαιῶν, ἀλλὰ τὸ τὰς τροπὰς γινέσθαι πρὶν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ γὰρ θερινῶν τροπῶν ἢ δρχὴ ἦν ἐκείνοις τῷ ἔτει. ὥσπερ Ῥωμαίοις ὕστερον ἀπὸ τῶν χειμερινῶν. And he cites *Simplicius* (Lib. in Phys. Aristot.) saying; ὅς τινες ποιεῖμεν δρχὰς, ἐνιαυτὸν μὲν πρὶν θερινὰς τροπὰς, ὡς Ἀθλωαῖοι ἢ πρὶν μεσοπωρινὰς, ὡς οἱ πρὶν τὴν νῦν καλεσθῆναι Ἀσίαν (i. e. the *Macedonian Asiatics*) ἢ πρὶν χειμερινὰς, ὡς Ῥωμαῖοι ἢ πρὶν ἱερὰς, ὡς Ἀρχαῖοι καὶ Δαμασκηνοί. Apud *Petav. Uranolog.* p. 284.

26 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

Flood were dispersed, and where the first astronomical Observations were made, always reckoned the Year from the vernal Equinox, as did likewise the *Chinese* in their most early Times. *Berosus* (42) found in the ancient *Babylonian* Records, that the *Noachic* Deluge began in the second *Chaldaean* Month, which was called *Jiar* or *Jar*, and corresponded with the *Macedonian* Month called *Dæsius*, which was part of *April* and part of *May*. Whence it appears that the *Chaldaeans*, and from them the *Medes* and *Persians* who had the same Year, thought that it originally began at the vernal Equinox.

The Year of *Romulus*, and of the *Latins* before him, began in the Spring, or about the vernal Equinox, the first Month being called by him from *Mars*, his supposed Father, *Martius*: and the older *Alban* Year began in the Spring and ended in *February*: and this continued for several Ages before *Julius Cæsar* changed the Beginning of it to the Winter Solstice and the Month of *January*: and all their Intercalations were made in *February*, or at the End of it, to shew that it was the last Month, and ended the Year in the most ancient *Roman* Calendar. On this account *Virgil* thought the World had its Beginning in the Spring (43).

Philo Judæus (44), from ancient *Jewish* Traditions, thought that God's Command to *Moses* to make *Nisan* or *Abib* the Beginning of the Year,

(42) Apud Syncel. p. 30, 38. ex Alex. Polyhist. et Abyden.

(43.) Non alios prima crescentis origine mundi

Inluxisse dies, aliumve habuisse tenorem

Crediderim : ver illud erat, etc. Georg. lib. ii. v. 336, &c.

(44) ἱεραρχία ὡς ὁ μὲν εἶπεν (Abib) ἀρχὴ μὲν τε καὶ τὰ ἐξ ἡλίου κύκλου, ὡς αὖτε πρῶτος ἐστὶ διότι καὶ πρῶτος ἐστὶ τῆς ἱεραρχίας βίβλος ἀναγράφει. αἴτιον δὲ, ὡς γε οἶμαι, πῶς ἡ ἐκκλησία ἱσχυροῦται ἀπεικονισμῶς τε καὶ μίμημα (συμβεβηκέναι εἶναι τὸ δόγμα ἐκείνης καθ' ἣν εἶδε ὁ κόσμος ἐκκλησιαστικῶς. καθ' ἑκάστον ἐν ἐνιαυτῷ ὑπερμυμνήσκων ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον γένεσιν ἀνέφηνε πρὸς ἑαυτὸν, ἐν ᾧ πάντα ἀνέβη καὶ βλαστάνει. διόπερ οὕτως καὶ (κατὰ πρῶτον ἀναγράφει) μὲν ἐν πᾶσι νόμοις, ἔπειτα τίς ποτε τινὰ τὸ πρῶτον δόγμα ἐκμαγαλῶν ἐστι, ἀπὸ ἐκείνης ὡς αὖτε δόγμα ὑπὲρ (Θεογιδῶς τυπωθεὶς. This Month being the seventh in Number and Order according to the Course of the Sun (i. e. reckoned from the autumnal Equinox, whence the civil Year commenced) is virtually the first; and is therefore called the first in the sacred Writings. And the Reason, I think, is this: because the vernal Equinox is the Image and Representation of the original Epoch of the Creation of the World. God therefore notified the Spring, in which all things put forth

was restoring it to the original Epoch of it at the Creation : and the Oriental Chronicle agrees with him, and relates that the Children of *Israel* sacrificed the Paschal Lamb on *Wednesday* the 19th Day of *March* or *Nisan*, on the 14th Day of the Moon at the vernal Equinox, *at which Time the World was created.* And many ancient Christian Writers were of the same Opinion.

From the foregoing Account it appears, that all the Ancients in all Nations (that we know of) agreed that the World was created and the Year began at one of the cardinal Points of the Zodiac ; either at one of the Equinoxes, or at the Summer Solstice. And as this is highly probable, so I think there is most Reason to place the cardinal Point of the World's *Æra* in the vernal Equinox, where the *Chaldæans* and other ancient Eastern Nations placed it.

Moses, indeed, has not directly told us what Time of the Year the Earth was created (if he had, there would need no farther Enquiry about it) but yet the natural and regular Order and Constitution of things, as will be observed presently, lead us to conclude that the vernal Equinox is more likely to have been the Epoch of it, than any of the other cardinal Points of the Zodiac. And *Moses* himself also intimates this in his Relation of the *Noachic* Deluge; which began, as he tells us (*Gen. vii. 11.*) in the *second Month* of the Year. For it is observable that *Moses* with all the other Writers of the Old Testament always reckons the Months from the vernal Equinox, or *Abib*, or *Nisan*. This will be evident to any one who examines all the Passages where the several Months are mentioned. *Moses* calls the *first*

and flourish, to be an annual Memorial of the World's Creation. Wherefore this Month is properly called the first in the Law, as being the Image of the first original Month, stamped upon it as it were from that Archetypal Seal. De Septenar. et Fest. p. 1190, 1191. Dies qua præceperat Deus Moyfi et Aaroni immolare agnum in terra *Ægypti*, ea nocte qua egressi sunt, fuit feria quarta vigesima tertia mensis Barmehati, et decima nona Martii, et decima quarta Lunæ Nisan, quæ erat Luna Di-Alhagia. Erat autem dies iste in quo Sol ingressus est primum signum Arietis, et est *initium annorum mundi.* Chron. Orient. edit. ab Abrahamo Eccheliensi Syro Maronita e Libano Paris. 1685. And Syncellus relates from an old *Jewish* Book called the *Life of Adam*, that the World was created in the Month *Nisan*, at the vernal Equinox. Chronograph. p. 5.

28 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

vernal Month *Abib*, the first Month of the Year; and it is called *Nisan*, which was the *Syriac* or *Chaldaean* Name, *Ezra*. iii. 7. The second Month is called *Zif*, *1 Kings* vi. 1. which was the *Hebrew* Name of the *Chaldaean* second Month *Jiar* or *Jar*, which answers to part of *April* and part of *May*: the seventh Month so called was *Tisri*, *September*, etc. *Chisleu*, or *November*, etc. is the ninth Month, *Zech*. vii. 1. *Tebeth*, or *December*, etc. is called the tenth Month, *Ezra*. ii. 16. The eleventh Month is called *Sebat*, which was *January*, etc. *Zech*. i. 7. The twelfth Month is *Adar*, *February*, etc. *Ezra*. iii. 7. and *2 Maccab*. xv. 36. So that all the Months called *first*, *second*, etc. till the *Jews* received the *Chaldaean* Names, had always a Reference to the Year beginning with *Abib* or *Nisan*, at the vernal Equinox. And it is particularly to be noted, that when *Moses* speaks of the Commencement of the civil Year, which was at the autumnal Equinox in the Month *Tisri*, he never calls it the *first* Month of the Year, but always the seventh. So it is called *Levit*. xxv. 9. and the *Jubilean* Year which then began, and the Feast of Tabernacles, were both in the seventh Month, *Numb*. xxix. 1. *Levit*. xxiii. 34. *Neb*. viii. 14. All this demonstrates that *Moses* reckoned the Months of the Year from *Nisan* or the vernal Equinox. And therefore the second Month when the Flood began, by the constant Computation of *Moses* in all other Places, and of all the Writers of the Old Testament, must be the second reckoned from the vernal Equinox: and had *Moses* meant the second Month reckoned from the autumnal Equinox, he would have called it not the *second* but the *eighth* Month, as it is several times called elsewhere, and agreeably to his calling the *first* Month of the civil Year, the seventh Month, *i. e.* from *Nisan*. Therefore as *Moses* saies the Flood began in the second Month of the Year reckoned, as we have seen, from the vernal Equinox; as it is reasonable to think, and is generally allowed that he meant the second Month of the antediluvian Year, we may justly conclude that this Year originally and at the Creation of the World commenced at the vernal Equinox. And in further Confirmation of this it may be added, that as the Account of the antediluvian Ages, and of the Flood and following Ages down to *Abraham*, was brought by *Abraham* out of *Chaldaea*, and preserved by his Posterity,

rity, from whom *Moses* received it ; the Months of the Year must have been reckoned from the most ancient *Chaldæan* Epoch of the Year commencing at or about the vernal Equinox.

This Situation of the Earth in the solar Orbit was most agreeable to the Place where our first Parents lived. It is natural to suppose that God would let them enjoy the increasing Light of the Sun, and the first growing Products of the new Earth ; that all Nature should appear young, gay, vigorous, and healthful at the (45) Creation ; the Earth be adorned with fresh and thriving Grass and Herbs, a sweet Repast both for Man and other living Creatures ; Corn ripe and fit for Food ; and the Trees abounding with their several Fruits, some ripe and prepared to please the Taste and satisfy the Appetite ; others growing to Maturity, and others blooming and promising a future Pleasure. This would be the natural Representation of the Earth, if it was created at the vernal Equinox ; but if it was created at the autumnal Equinox, the Face of the new-born Earth would have naturally appeared all faded ; not as having just received Life, but as going to die ; its Grass and Herbs withered and decayed ; and all its Fruits fallen, and most of them rotten ; the Day constantly shortening and gloomy Night encreasing. It is well known that in the warm Climate where the Land of *Eden* was, between the *Tigris* and *Euphrates*, in the South Parts of *Mesopotamia*, *Babylonia*, and *Chaldæa*, both which it might comprehend, the Fruits of the Earth are all gathered before the autumnal Equinox, as they were in *Judæa*, *Exod.* xxiii. 16. So that it must be very absurd to suppose the Earth to be created at that Season, when it is naturally deprived of all its Beauty and Fruits, and nothing can grow for the proper Sustenance either of Man or Beast.

It being proved that the Earth was created at the vernal Equinox, the first Parents of Mankind, *Adam* and *Eve*, were created when the

(45) *Ovid*, speaking of the Year, thus elegantly describes the Spring, viz.

Nam tener et lactens, puerique simillimus ævo
Vere novo est. tunc herba nitens, et roboris experts
Turget, et infolida est ; et spe delectat agrestem.
Omnia tum florent ; florumque coloribus almus
Ridet ager, etc.

Metamorph. xv. 201, etc.

Sun entered either the *sixth* or the *third* Degree of *Aries* (as Astronomers commonly speak) or the then vernal equinoctial Sign, according as we reckon the annual Motion of the Earth to have begun either on the first or on the fourth Day of the Creation. So they were created about the Middle of *March*, in the first Year of the World, and in the Year 5426 before the vulgar Christian *Æra*. This Date of the *Æra* of the Creation will be particularly and fully proved hereafter.

Supposing, as hath been before observed from an ancient *Jewish* Book called the *Small Genesis*, that *Adam* and *Eve* lived together in Paradise seven Years before their Expulsion for Disobedience to the divine Command, and eating the forbidden Fruit; then it is probable that *Cain* was born the Year after, in the latter End of the eighth Year of the Creation, *Anno ante Chr.* 5418. *Gen.* iv. 1. The fore-mentioned *Small Genesis* makes *Abel* to be born seven Years after *Cain*, that is *Anno ante Chr.* 5411. And this is the soonest we can reasonably suppose the Birth of *Abel*. For it is probable that *Eve* gave suck to *Cain* not less than six or seven Years, but rather nine or ten Years, in Proportion to the Term of Maturity and long Lives of the Antediluvians, which were ten times longer or more than they now commonly are (46).

(46) That the first Race of Men lived to about a thousand Years of Age was known to all the Ancients, both the Eastern, *Greek*, and *Latin* Writers. *Josephus* (*Antiq. Jud.* lib. i. c. 3.) makes mention of many of the oldest *Chaldean*, *Phœnician*, *Egyptian*, and *Greek* Writers, who related that in the most ancient Times Men lived a thousand Years: and Varro, the most learned of the *Latin* Writers, having observed this universal Tradition, endeavoured to assign the Reason why the Ancients were thought to have lived a thousand Years.

Lactantius (*Institut.* ii. Sect. 12.) speaking of Mankind immediately after the Fall, saies; Sic facta hominis vita est temporaria, sed tamen longa, quæ in mille annos propagaretur: quod divinis literis proditum, et per omnium scientiam publicatum cum Varro non ignoraret, argumentari nixus est, cur putarentur antiqui mille annos vixisse. Varro resolved these thousand Years into Months, or lunar Years; which was a very weak Solution; because in his Days it was common for Men to live longer than a thousand Months, or eighty-three Years. But *Onomacritus*, in his *Orphic Argonauts*, mentions a People, called *Macrobiani*, who lived twelve thousand Months, or a thousand Years.

Abel

Abel was a Shepherd, and *Cain* a Tiller of the Ground, *Gen.* iv. 2. And we hear of no more Children of *Adam* till the Birth of *Seth*, when he was two hundred and thirty Years old: but we must believe that *Adam* had, besides *Cain* and *Abel*, many Children, both Sons and Daughters, before the Birth of *Seth*. We may well suppose him to have had twenty-three (if *Eve* bare no Twins) which is a Child in every ten Years: and several of these were married and had Children before the Birth of *Seth*.

As God had promised, *Gen.* i. 28. that our first Parents should be *fruitful and multiply*, there is no doubt but that they had Children as fast as the Course of Nature would permit; and that *Eve* always conceived again as soon as any Child she had before was weaned.

Adam and his Family lived together, and worshiped God with Prayer, Thanksgivings, and (47) Sacrifices in the same Place for many

— Πολλὰς ζώων ἐνιαυτῶν,

Δώδεκα χιλιάδας μιλῶν.

Agreeably to this Account *Hesiod* describing the second Race of Men, supposes them to be infants, and not grown to Maturity, at the Ages of *an hundred Years*.

Ἀλλ' ἐκατόν μὲν παῖς ἔτεα, πρὶν μὴ τέλει κενεῇ

Ἐπεφείλ' ἀτάκτων μέγα νήπιον ὃ ἐν οἴκῳ. Op. et Dies, ψ 130, 131.

And the ten *Chaldean* antediluvian Reigns in *Berosus* help to confirm this Number of Years; for they are successive Reigns of Fathers and Sons; several of whom reigned 180 Years: and others 130, 120, and 100 Years.

(47) The first Sacrifices of Beasts were probably appointed by God, as *Eusebius* hath observed, *Demonst. Evang.* lib. i. c. 10. p. 35. Ed. Paris. 1628. And hence came the Distinction of Beasts *clean* and *unclean*, *Gen.* vii. 2. Those were accounted *clean* which were offered in Sacrifice, and those *unclean* which might not be sacrificed. And with the Skins of sacrificed Beasts our first Parents were cloathed, *Gen.* iii. 21. And though they had lived naked in Paradise where they had no need of Garments; yet being driven out thence into the higher and colder Country on the North-east of *Eden*, they would want Clothes, not only to conceal their Nakedness, but also to keep them warm in this colder Region. These Clothes were made of the Skins of Animals which they offered in Sacrifice: for they were not allowed to kill them to eat. And Sacrifices were most probably appointed by God to be the perpetual Type and Representation of the propitiatory Sacrifice of the *Messias* who was promised to *Adam* and *Hove* immediately after their Fall, as *the Seed of the Woman*, which was *to bruise the Serpent's Head*, and deliver them and their Descendants from the Curse of Mortality, which they had incurred by the Temptation of the Serpent, *i. e.* the *old Serpent, the Devil*, as St.

Years: till in Process of Time it happened that *Cain* finding his Offerings which he made to God were not accepted (on account of his secret Wickedness and Impiety) and that the Offerings of his Brother *Abel* were accepted, he immediately formed a Design against his Brother's Life, though God admonished him not to be angry with him, *Gen.* iv. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. and soon after murdered him in the Field, and buried his Body in the Ground, as is intimated *Y* 10, 11. where the Blood of *Abel* is said to cry from or out of the Ground, as the *Greek Translation* has it, and as *Josephus* (48) understood it: and *the Earth* is said to have opened her Mouth to receive it.

The Reason of God's accepting the Offerings of *Abel* (which probably was shewn by consuming them with (49) Fire from Heaven)

John and *St. Paul* call him, *Rev.* xii. 9. xx. 2. *Heb.* ii. 14. Thus *Christ* was the Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World: His Death being pre-ordained by the Purpose of God, and typified and represented by the Sacrifice of Lambs, etc. from the Beginning, *Rev.* xiii. 8. 1 *Pet.* i. 19, 20. This through the Mercy of God was their Comfort after they were driven out of *Paradise* and from the *Tree of Life*, that a Redeemer should be born of the Woman's Seed, who should be made a Sacrifice for Sin and the Restorer of that Immortality which they had lost by eating of the forbidden Fruit: and which Fruit, probably, by a malignant and deadly Quality inherent in it, altered the Constitution of our first Parents, and brought Death on their Bodies by slow Degrees, which was propagated to all their Descendants; and could not be prevented but by eating the Fruit of the *Tree of Life*, from which they were for ever to be debarred and excluded. Thus God, in his just Judgment on our first Parents, remembered Mercy, and promised a Redeemer, and appointed Sacrifices of innocent Animals to preresent the Sacrifice of his future Death; and to preserve the Knowledge and belief of it till his coming in the Flesh: and to make those who offered them with true Faith and Repentance acceptable to God. All this Account is agreeable to true Reason and Philosophy.

(48) *Antiq. Jud.* lib. i. c. 2.

(49.) So *Theodotion* understands it. And *Jerome* agrees with him, Unde scire poterat *Cain* quod fratris munera suscepisset Deus, et sua repudiasset: nisi illa interpretatio vera est, quam *Theodotion* posuit, viz. *Et inflammavit Dominus super Abel & super sacrificium ejus: super Cain vero et super sacrificium ejus non inflammavit.* Ignem vero ad sacrificium devorandum solitum venire de coelo, et in dedicatione templi sub *Salomone* legimus; et quando *Elas* in monte *Carmelo* construxit altare. *Quæst. in Genes.* p. 511. Edit. *Parisi.* 1699.

and

and rejecting the Offerings of *Cain*, was undoubtedly the grateful and religious Temper of the one, and the profane and irreligious Disposition of the other. The Reason which *St. John* gives is very good, viz. *Because his (Cain's) Works were evil, and his Brother's righteous, 1 Job. iii. 12.* But the principal Reason is suggested by *St. Paul, Heb. xi. 4.* that *Abel* offered his Sacrifice *in Faith*, viz. of the *promised Seed* revealed to his Parents which was to break the Serpent's Head, and to deliver Mankind from the Curse of Mortality by a Resurrection from the Dead. On the other Hand *Cain* offered his Sacrifice without this Faith; and probably was so profane as to despise or disbelieve the divine Promise: though the first Sacrifices were instituted on Account of the Sacrifice of the *promised Seed*, by which the Redemption of Mankind was to be procured and published in the Gospel-Revelation; and seem intended from the Beginning to be a Type and Representation of it. Hence it appears that the primitive Faith in the future *Messias* who was the promised Seed, inferred the Belief of a Resurrection through him, from Death to a State of Immortality. This throws great Light upon both the *Jewish* and *Christian* Revelation, and shews their Connection and mutual Dependence, and how the latter has brought to Light that *Life and Immortality* which was promised and typified in the former. Farther, *Abel* offered the *Firstlings of his Flock*, the best and fattest of them, with Thanksgiving to God for the Increase of it, *Gen. iv. 4.* But *Cain* did not offer the First-fruits of his Land and the best of them; but separated out of the Fruits of his Ground the worst Part, which he offered grudgingly unto God, *¶ 7.* This is more clearly expressed in the *Greek* Translation than it is in the *Hebrew* Text.

The Sense of the *Greek* Version is, *If thou hast offered thy Sacrifice rightly, but hast not made a right Separation of it (from the rest of thy Fruits, and hast not offered the best of them) hast thou not sinned? Hold thy Peace therefore, repent, and be not angry with thy Brother: Thou shalt still keep the Privilege of thy Primogeniture, and rule over him. ¶ 6, 7.*

As *Seth* was born soon after the Murder of *Abel*, when *Adam* was 230 Years of Age, it is probable that *Cain* was at least 220 Years old

when he slew his Brother. He was then married, but how long he had been so, is not said; nor is it certain that (50) *Abel* was married.

As *Adam* for his Disobedience was turned out of the Garden of *Eden*; so *Cain* for the crying Sin of Murder which he had committed, was driven out from the Presence of God, *Gen.* iv. 14. *To be a Fugitive and a Vagabond in the Earth.* He therefore went out and dwelt *on the East of Eden*, *ŷ* 16. beyond *Tigris*, probably in the inland Parts of *Susiana*, whither he carried his (51) Wife and Family, to be safe from his Brethren, who he feared would find and slay him, *ŷ* 14. Here he had a Son called *Hensch*; and afterwards builded a City which he called after his Name, *ŷ* 17. This was probably the *Anuctha* of *Ptolemy*, which he places in (52) *Susiana*. Some Remains of it might be left after the Flood; and it might then be rebuilt, or another City be builded in the same Place, and called by the same Name.

After God had pronounced his Curse and Sentence of Banishment upon *Cain*, he felt a Remorse for what he had done, and was grieved at the Thoughts of being driven from his Father and his native Country into a desolate Place; and especially that he must leave the Place of divine Worship where *the Presence of God was*; and this made him despair of being reconciled to the divine Favour, ver. 13, 14. However God assured him by a Sign or Token which he gave him, that he should not be slain by any of his Brethren, ver. 15.

Sanboniatbo (53) related from the *Hermetic Phœnician Annals* that *Cain* prayed to the Sun as the only Lord of Heaven, whom he there-

(50) *Epiphanius adv. Hæres.* lib. i. p. 287, thinks that *Abel* was not married.

(51) His Wife's Name is not mentioned; but as she was his Sister and probably the eldest Daughter of *Adam* and *Hewe*, her Name might be called *Caina*, as *Sanboniatbo* found in the *Annals of Taaut* the Son of *Misor* or *Misraim*, as he says. He probably wrote her Name כַּיְנָה *Caina*, which *Philo* of *Byblus* rendered Γενεα, as he did *Cain* by Γένε. *Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang.* lib. i. p. 34. *Epiphanius* says from the *Small Genesis* that the Name of *Cain's* Wife was *Save*. *Adv. Hæres.* lib. i. p. 287. The *Small Genesis* in *Synellus* calls her Name *Asua*. *Chron.* p. 9.

(52) *Geograph.* lib. vi. p. 150.

(53) *Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang.* lib. i. p. 34.

fore called *Beelsamen*, that is, *Lord of Heaven*. So much may be true ; that *Cain* being driven from the *Face* or *Presence* of God, which was probably represented by a *Schechinah* of Light, before which he used to worship God ; he might make his Prayers and pay his Adorations towards the Sun, as being the best Representation of the Presence or Glory of God. But I think it not probable that he forsook the Worship of God, or really worshiped the Sun as the only Lord of Heaven, which he could not but know was created by God. And as *Cain* and his Descendants might worship and pray to the Lord of Heaven, looking towards the Sun as the most glorious Emblem of the divine Presence or *Face* of God ; so the Tradition of this Worship might in after-Ages lay the Foundation of worshiping the Sun as the Lord of Heaven and Governor of the World, which was the most ancient Superstition practised in *Phœnicia*, *Chaldæa*, and *Egypt*. (54).

(54) It seems as if the Family of *Cain* began to neglect the true Worship of God about the Time of the Birth of *Enos*, which was in the Year of the World 436. And therefore the other Part of *Adam's* Family, who lived separately from them, were distinguished by their religious Worship of God, and were called after his Name, *Sons of God*: and *Cain's* Race, for their Contempt of or Profanation of the divine Worship, and being addicted to worldly Business and Pleasures of Life, were called *Sons of Men*; as having little or no Regard to the Service and Worship of God, or worshiping him in an impure and unholy Manner. This may be inferred from *Gen. iv. 26.* where it is said, that when *Enos* was born, *Men began to call themselves* (or *to be called*) *by the Name of the Lord*; as it is rendered in the Margin of our Bibles, and by *Aquila* the *Jewish* Interpreter. And hence, *Gen. vi. 2, 4* they are called *Sons of God*, in Distinction to the Descendants of *Cain*, called *Daughters of Men*. This seems to be the best Sense of the Words which are ambiguous, because the *Hebrew* Word (הוֹחֵל) signifies either *began* or *was profaned*. And if the Words be taken in the latter Sense, as the ancient *Jews* generally understood them; viz. *Then was the Name of the Lord profaned in Invocation*: in this Sense they referred to *Cain* and his Family, who had then begun to profane the Name of God in their Invocations and Worship. And this might be, as *Sanhoniatho* relates, by their praying to the Sun as being the divine *Schechinah*, and calling him *Lord of Heaven*, which was a Profanation of God's Name. But I prefer the first Sense of the Words.

36 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

After the Banishment of *Cain Moses* in a Digression gives a short Genealogy of his Family, and enumerates six of his Descendants. Then he relates the Birth of *Seth*; and in the fifth Chapter delivers the Genealogy of *Adam's* Descendants in the Line of *Seth* down to the Flood.

This Genealogy is as follows: from the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* Texts; and the *Greek* Version of the LXXII, and *Josephus*.

Gen. ch. v.

	<i>Lived Years before the Son's Birth.</i>				<i>After the Son's Birth.</i>				<i>Length of Lives.</i>			
	<i>Heb.</i>	<i>Sam.</i>	<i>LXXII</i>	<i>Jof.</i>	<i>Heb.</i>	<i>Sam.</i>	<i>LXXII</i>	<i>Jof.</i>	<i>Heb.</i>	<i>Sam.</i>	<i>LXXII</i>	<i>Jof.</i>
<i>Adam</i>	130	130	230	230	800	800	700	700	930	930	930	930
<i>Seth</i>	105	105	205	205	807	807	707	707	912	912	912	912
<i>Enos</i>	90	90	190	190	815	815	715	715	905	905	905	905
<i>Cainan</i>	70	70	170	170	840	840	740	740	910	910	910	910
<i>Melaleel</i>	65	65	165	165	830	830	730	730	895	895	895	895
<i>Jared</i>	162	62	162	162	800	785	800	800	962	847	962	962
<i>Enoch</i>	65	† 65	165	165	300	300	200	200	365	365	365	365
<i>Matbujelab</i>	187	67	187	187	782	653	782	782	969	720	969	969
<i>Lamech</i>	182	53	188	182	595	600	565	595	777	653	753	777
<i>Noah at the Flood</i>	600	600	600	600								
<i>To the Flood</i>	1656	1307	2262	2256								

In the preceding Table I have given the Numbers of the Years from the Creation to the Flood as they are found in the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* Texts, and in the Version of the LXXII *Greek* Interpreters, or the *Septuagint* as it is commonly called; and also in the third Chapter of the first Book of the *Jewish* Antiquities of *Josephus*. The *Hebrew*

† *Enoch* has no more than 60 Years in the Copy of *Eusebius* of the *Samaritan Hebrew* Text in *Syncellus* p. 83. But *Syncellus* wrote from *Eusebius* 65 (ξ; not ξ) as is evident from his making the *Samaritan* differ from the *Septuagint*. whose Number he says was 2242) 935 Years: and he also says that the Years of the *Samaritan* Copy from the Creation to the Flood are 1307. *Chronograph.* p. 85, 89.

makes

makes these Years 1656, the *Samaritan* 1307, the *Septuagint* 2262, and *Josephus* 2256, which last is, I think, the true Number of Years. The *Samaritan* differs from the *Hebrew* 349 Years; and from the *Septuagint* 955 Years; and from *Josephus* 949 Years. The Reason of this great Corruption of the *Samaritan Hebrew* Text will be particularly shewn and cleared. The Difference between the *Jewish Hebrew* Text and *Josephus*, from his *Hebrew* Text, is just 600 Years: and the Ground of this Difference is evident: viz, That in six of the Generations, namely, the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and seventh, a Century is taken away in the present *Masoret Hebrew* Text, from the Years of the Patriarchs before they begat their Sons, and is added to the remaining Term of their Lives: and that the present *Jewish Hebrew* Text has been altered by the *Jews* will be fully proved.

We may observe there is no more than a Difference of six Years between the Numbers of the *Septuagint*, and those of *Josephus*; and these six Years are in the Life of *Lamech* before he begat *Noah*: All the *Greek* Copies of the *Septuagint* but one, (the *Oxford* which gives him 180 Years (55) to the Birth of *Noah*) giving him 188 Years, and *Josephus* no more than 182.

That the Number 188 Years was in all the ancient and best *Greek* Copies, appears from the following concurring Evidence. This Number was in the most ancient *Cottonian* Manuscript, lately burnt. It is in the *Vatican*, *Alexandrine*, *Venetian* or *Aldine*, and *Complutense* MSS. and Copies. (56) *Theophilus*, Bishop of *Antioch*, in the second Century, has this Number. (57) And *Africanus* and (58) *Origen* in the third Century; and (59) *Eusebius* and *Jerome* in the fourth. The *Chronicon Paschale*, the Ecclesiastical Computation of *Maximus*, the *Chronography* of *Georgius* (60) *Syncellus*, and the *Chronography* of *Ni-*

(55) *Chrysostom* has 180. *Hom.* 21. in *Gen.*

(56) *Ad Autolyc.* lib. iii.

(57) *Apud Syncell. Chronograph.* p. 81. also p. 20.

(58) *Sched. Combef. ap. Montfauc. Hexap. in Gen.* c. v. p. 22.

(59) *Apud Syncell.* p. 82. *Chronic.* lib. i. p. 7. where the Number is by Mistake, 187 for 188.

(60) p. 81, 114.

38 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

cephorus Patriarch (61) of *Constantinople*, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* of *Bede*, have all of them this Number: and also all those ancient and correct *Greek Copies*, which (62) *Augustine* mentions, and which made *Mathuselah* die six Years before the Flood, and accordingly he says they reckoned from *Adam* to the Flood 2262 Years, but that the *Hebrews* reckoned no more than 1656 Years. Lastly, the same Number appears from the *Jewish History* of (63) *Demetrius*, who was not far distant in Time from the *Greek Interpreters* themselves. He lived in the Reign of *Ptolemy Philopator*, and about 220 Years before the Christian *Æra*. He reckoned 3624 Years from *Adam* or the Creation to the Migration of *Jacob's* Family into *Egypt*; and from the Flood to the same Time he computed 1360 Years, or rather 1362 Years (the 2 Years of *Sem* after the Flood to the Birth of *Arphaxad* being added.) These 1362 Years being deducted from 3624, he must have computed from the Creation to the Flood 2262 Years: And so he must have given 188 Years to *Lamech* before the Birth of *Noah*. From the foregoing Testimonies it is highly probable that the Number of the *Septuagint* 188 is not an Error of any Transcriber, but was the original Number of the *Greek* (64) *Interpreters* themselves. On the other Hand, the Number 182 which is in all the present Copies of the *Hebrew Text* is supported by no less Evidence of its being the original Reading of that Text.

(61) *Apud Syncell. Fin. Chronograph.*

(62) *De Civ. Dei*, lib. xv. c. x. Antequam gigneret [*Lamech*] filium qui vocatus est *Noë*, sex minus (annos) habet in *Hebræis* (codicibus) quam in nostris. And these he says were 188, c. 11. And *Quæst. 2. in Gen.* he says: Verum etiam in *LXX* interpretatione *Mathusalem* in codicibus paucioribus, sed veracioribus, sex annos ante diluvium reperitur fuisse defunctus. Again, *De Civ. Dei*, lib. xv. c. 20. he says: Ex *Adam* usque ad diluvium computantur anni secundum codices nostros duo millia ducenti sexaginta duo: secundum *Hebræos* autem mille sexcenti quinquaginta sex.

(63) *Ap. Euseb. Præp. Evang.* lib. ix. c. 21. p. 425.

(64) The *Oriental Chronicle* published by *Abraham Ecchellenfis* a Syrian *Maronite* from Mount *Libanus*, gives to *Lamech* before the Birth of *Noah*, 182 Years from the *Septuagint*, p. 2. and also the *Alexandrine Annals* of *Eutychius* give him the same Number from the *Greek Version*, p. 28. *Edit. Pocock*. This shews that some *Greek Copies* agreed with the *Hebrew Number*, but the most ancient and correct Copies had 188 Years.

Not

Not only the *Vulgate*, *Chaldee Paraphrase*, *Syriac*, and *Arabic* Versions have this Number; but *Josephus* had it in his *Hebrew* Copy, which might be that belonging to the Temple which he had Liberty to make Use of. *Jerome* (65) also says that he found this Number in the old *Samaritan Hebrew* Text. The *Oriental* (66) *Chronicle*, and the *Anglo-Saxon* *Chronicle* (67) of *Bede*, have both of them this Number. And lastly, *Eusebius* (68) found this Number in the *Hebrew* Text. For having observed that *Mathuselah* had 187 Years given him to the Birth of *Lamech*, he adds that *he lived to the Time of the Flood*: which shews that *Lamech* had in the Text 182 Years to the Birth of *Noah*, and so *Mathuselah* died the same Year that the Flood came.

From the foregoing Evidence we may very reasonably conclude, that the Number of 182 Years ascribed in the *Hebrew* Text, and by *Josephus* to *Lamech* before the Birth of *Noah*, is the original Number of that Text; and therefore is to be thought the true Number: and there is an Error of six Years in the Version of the LXXII, which seems to have proceeded from their mistaking the numeral Letter which denoted *two*, for that which signified *Eight*. And hence also it appears that the *Jews* have made no other Alterations in the Years of the *Antediluvian* Patriarchs, before the Birth of their Sons, but taking exactly a Century from six of them, and adding it to the after-Term of their Lives.

Whether the Numbers of the *Septuagint*, or those of *Josephus* in the preceding Table be admitted, they make a Difference only of six Years in Chronology from the Creation to the Flood. And it appears from the Numbers of both, that *Mathuselah* with the rest did not survive the Deluge: and that he died either in the Year of the Flood, a little Time before it drowned the Earth, according to the *Hebrew* Account; or six Years before, according to the Computation of the *Septuagint*.

(65) *Quæst. in Gen.* Tom. 2. p. 513. *Edit. Martianan.*

(66) p. 2.

(67) *Edit. Smith.*

(68) *Apud Syncel. Chronograph.* p. 82. His Words are, Μαθουσαλα γενόμενος ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ πεντήκοντα ἑπτὰ ἐτῶν (i. e. 187.) γενεᾷ τῇ Δομέχ, ἣ ἐπέζησεν ψπβ'. (i. e. 782.) ἕως αὐτῆς τῆς κατὰ αὐτὸν πλημμύρας.

But

But a different Reading in the *Septuagint* of the Years of *Matbuselab* before the Birth of *Lamech*, caused a great Difficulty amongst the ancient Christian Writers and Chronologers. It appeared in most of the ancient *Greek* Copies that *Matbuselab* was no more than 167 Years old when he begat *Lamech*: and as all the Copies agreed that he lived 969 Years, this carried his Life fourteen Years beyond the Time of the Flood, whereas it was acknowledged to be certain from the *Mosaic* History that none survived the Deluge but *Noah* and his Family.

This Number of 167 Years of *Matbuselab* before the Birth of *Lamech* is in the *Vatican* Manuscript of the *Septuagint*, which is one of the most ancient Copies known to be extant. And the Reading of this Number is as old as *Origen*, who had it in his *Hexaplar* Copy: And this Copy was followed by (69) *Eusebius*, *Jerome*, (70) *Syncellus*, and others. *Augustine* found this Number in the common Copies; and it is in *Bede's* (71) *Anglo-Saxon* Chronicle.

That this Reading was in the *Septuagint* Copy of *Origen's* *Hexapla* appears from (72) *Combesfius's* Extracts of it published by *Montfaucon*: and therefore *Origen* was the first who observed (73) *there was a Disagreement of fifteen (rather fourteen) Years in the Age of Matbuselab*; which carried him so many Years beyond the Flood, according to the Reckoning of the entire Term of his Life, which all agree to be 969 Years. For they who gave him 167 Years to the Birth of *Lamech*, and 802 Years after, as all the Copies did which had this Number, to make up the whole Term of his Age 969 Years, carried him fourteen Years beyond the Flood, which by this Computation was in the Year of the World 2242. For

(69) Chron. lib. prior. p. 7. and *Apud Syncel. Chronograph.* p. 82.

(70) *Chronograph.* p. 20, 81. &c.

(71) p. 3.

(72) Τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὸ Σαμαρείαν· Καὶ ἔζησε Μαθυσάλα ἔτη ρπζ. (187) καὶ ἐγέννησε Λάμεχ. Ο'. (i. e. LXX) Καὶ ἔζησε Μαθυσάλα ἐπὶ α' ἔτη καὶ ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν, καὶ ἐγέννησε Λάμεχ. *Montfaucon. Hexap.* p. 21. et Not. p. 22.

(73) Περὶ τῆς Μαθυσάλας ἐνέστις· ἀλφωνία ἐτῶν ιε'. rectius ιδ'. *ibid.* p. 22.

167 Years of *Mathuselah*, and 188 Years of *Lamech* to the Birth of *Noah*, and 600 Years of *Noah* to the Flood, made no more than 955 Years, which are less by fourteen Years than the whole Age of *Mathuselah*.

How *Origen* solved this Difficulty of the *Septuagint* Reading we do not know. He might easily have solved it either by correcting this Number of 167 by the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* Numbers which were 187, as he observed in his *Hexapla*; or by following the most ancient Copies of the *Septuagint*, which, as we shall prove, had this Number: or else he must have shortened the Years of *Mathuselah* after the Birth of *Lamech*; and made his entire Age less by fourteen Years than both his *Hebrew* and *Greek* Copy made it.

The Method which *Eusebius* took to resolve the Difficulty was, as we learn from *Syncellus*, (74) to take the remaining Term of the Life of *Mathuselah* after the Birth of *Lamech* from those Copies which had 782 Years, as all had which agreed with the *Hebrew* Text in giving him 187 Years to the Birth of *Lamech*. For *Eusebius* supposing 167 to be the true Year of *Mathuselah's* Life to the Birth of *Lamech*, and finding in some Copies that *Mathuselah* lived after 782 Years, he joined together these Numbers of different Copies, and thereby shortened the Life of *Mathuselah* twenty

(74) Τινες ὅ φασιν, ὡν εἷς ὁ Ἐυσέβιος, ἔχεν τινὰ τῶ ἀντιγραφῶν ὅτι ψπβ'. [782] ἐπέζησεν μὲν τὸ γεννησάμενον αὐτὸν (*Lamech*.) ὡς γινέσθαι πάντα τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ χρόνον ἔτη θμθ'. [949] ὅπερ ἔκ εὖ ἔχεν δοκεῖ. ἔσονται γὰρ καὶ τῷτον τὸ λόγον αἱ ἀνὰ πάσας τὰς ἐκκλησίας τῶ Θεῷ ἱεροῖ βίβλοι τῆς Γενέσεως δισφαλμέναι, θξθ'. ἐτη ἰσορῶσαι τὸ Μαθυσάλα. Ἄλλ' ἔδὲ Ἀφρικανῶ πειθόμεθα προσιδέμεν τὰ αὐτὰ [leg. ἄλλα] κ'. ἔτη, κ' θπθ'. [989] λέγουσι τῶ Μαθυσάλα ἀντὶ θξθ'. [969] *Chronograph.* p. 114. The Error of *Syncellus* in the latter Part of the Words was, he supposed that *Africanus* not only gave 187 Years (as he says he did p. 20.) to *Mathuselah* before the Birth of *Lamech*; but also that he gave him after 20 Years more than *Eusebius* had done from some Copies, or 802 Years. Whereas his Copy, and all the Copies which had 187 Years to the Birth of *Lamech*, had no more than 782 Years after, which made the true Term of *Mathuselah's* Life. This Error was owing to *Syncellus's* never having seen a Copy which gave 187 Years to the Birth of *Lamech*, though he mentions such Copies p. 20. and therefore he supposed that they gave to *Mathuselah* 802 Years after the Birth of *Lamech*, as his own and the Copies commonly used did: whereas they gave no more than 782 Years, and agreed in the Sum total with the common Copies, though in each of the Particulars they differed 20 Years.

Years; and made him die six Years before the Flood, which he placed in the Year of the World 2242. *Syncellus* blames very justly this Conduct of *Eusebius*, as making the Years of *Matbuselab's* Life no more than 949 Years, which all agreed were 969. But he greatly mistakes in saying that *Africanus* added 20 Years to the Life of *Matbuselab* and made it 989 Years. The 20 Years which he added more than *Eusebius* had, were only to his Years preceding the Birth of *Lamech*; the Years after were the same; and so he gave *Matbuselab* no more than 969 Years, which was the true Sum of them.

Syncellus (75) took another Method to solve the Difficulty; and whereas all agreed that *Matbuselab* lived 969 Years; and, as he says, died in the Year of the Flood (though this is not true, for all who followed the Copies which gave *Matbuselab* 187 Years to the Birth of *Lamech*, placed his Death six Years before the Flood) he thinks it most probable that *Matbuselab* was born in the 151st Year of *Enoch*, and in the Year of the World 1273. And this last Number added to 969 the Years of *Matbuselab*, brought his Death to the Year of the World 2242, where he placed the Flood. This Solution was a mere Hypothesis and void of all Evidence, as *Syncellus* himself was sensible; and therefore afterward he supposes that *Matbuselab* really lived *fourteen* (76) *Years* after the Flood, and was miraculously preserved from it.

(75) Ὁμολογούμενον ἐστὶ πᾶσιν, ὅτι πάντων ἀνθρώπων μακροβιώτατος ὦν ὁ Μαθυσάλα, καὶ ὅτι ἐν τῷ κατὰ κλυσμῷ τέθηκεν. διὸ μάλλον ἂν τις τῷ ἐκατοστῷ πενήκοντῳ τρίτῳ (leg. πρώτῳ) ἔτει τῆς Ἐνῶχ ὑπελάβῃ τὴν Μαθυσάλα γεννηθῆναι. τὸ δ' ἐστὶν τῷ χιλιοστῷ ἀχαικοστῷ ἑξομνηκοστῷ τρίτῳ ἔτει τῆς κόσμου. τέτοις γὰρ προσθέμενα τὰ ἐννακόνσια ἐξηκόντια ἐνέει ἔτη τῆς Μαθυσάλα ζωῆς ποιεῖ ὅσμις. [2242] οἷς καὶ ὁ κατὰ κλυσμός σωτήρ ἐστι, καὶ ὃν τέθηκεν ὁ Μαθυσάλα. *Chronog.* p. 20.

Here it is plain *Syncellus* wrote or should have wrote the 151st Year of *Enoch*, and not the 153d, as his Copies have it; because this latter Number made only a Difference of 12 Years instead of 14, and still carried *Matbuselab* two Years beyond the Flood: and also by his own reckoning (p. 81.) the Year of the World 1273 was the 151st Year of *Enoch*.

(76) Οὕτως (Μαθυσάλα) καὶ τὰς ἀπαιτήσεις τῆς γενέσεως βίβλος ὑπερέβη τὸ κατὰ κλυσμόν ἔτησι 14. (ita leg. non ut Edit. ié.) ὥς ἄπορον εἶναι πᾶς διεσάβη ἐν τῷ κατὰ κλυσμῷ. Λοιπὸν εἴ κεν εἴσιν δεκά τῶν κατ' ἑλίου τὴν οἰκουμενὴν ἐπομβύας ἱερῶς βιβλοῖς δεξί.

Jerome

Jerome also followed the Septuagint Number of *Origen* and *Eusebius*, but solved the Difficulty by correcting it by the truer Numbers of the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* Text, which had 187 Years to the Birth of *Lamech*, and gave him 182 Years to the Birth of *Noah*, and so brought the Death of *Mathuselah* to the Year of the Flood.

Augustine (78) makes mention of the same Difficulty about the Death of *Mathuselah*: but observes that there were a few *Greek* Copies

[969] λέγειν τὴν ζωὴν Μαθυσάλα, εἰ καὶ τὴν κατακλυσμὸν ὑπερβέβηκεν ἔτεσι 187. (leg. id. 14.)
τῶν Θεῶν καὶ κείνων ἰσως, ὡς τὸ Ἐνὼχ, καὶ ἡ Εὐρώα, καὶ ἡ Ἀδὰμ, καὶ ἡ Ἄβελ, καὶ ἡ Ἥφα, καὶ ἡ Νόα, καὶ ἡ Ἰνὸς.
Ibid. p. 114.

(77) *Et vixit Mathusela annis centum sexaginta septem, et genuit Lamech. et vixit Mathusala postquam genuit Lamech annos octingentos duos — et fuerunt omnes dies Mathusale quos vixit, anni nongenti sexaginta novem, et mortuus est.* Famosa quæstio et disputatione omnium Ecclesiarum ventilata, quod juxta diligentem supputationem quatuordecim annos post diluvium Mathusala vixisse referatur. etenim quum esset Mathusala annorum centum sexaginta septem, genuit Lamech. rursum Lamech, quum esset annorum centum octoginta octo, genuit Noe. et fiunt simul usque ad diem nativitatis Noe, anni vitæ Mathusale trecenti quinquaginta quinque. Sexcentesimo autem anno vitæ Noe diluvium factum est. Ac per hoc habita supputatione per partes nongentesimo quinquagesimo quinto anno Mathusale diluvium fuisse convincitur. quum autem supra nongentis sexaginta novem annis vixisse sit dictus, nulli dubium est quatuordecim eum annos vixisse post diluvium. et quomodo verum est quod octo tantum animæ in arca salvæ factæ sunt? restat ergo ut quomodo in plerisque, ita et in hoc sit error in numero. siquidem et in Hebræis et Samaritanorum libris ita scriptum reperi: *et vixit Mathusala centum octoginta septem annis, et genuit Lamech. et vixit Mathusala postquam genuit Lamech, septingentos octoginta duos annos — et fuerunt omnes dies Mathusale anni nongenti sexaginta novem, et mortuus est. et vixit Lamech centum octoginta duobus annis, et genuit Noe.* A die ergo nativitatis Mathusale usque ad diem ortus Noe, sunt anni trecenti sexaginta novem: his adde sexcentos annos Noe; quia in sexcentesimo vitæ ejus anno factum est diluvium: atque ita fit, ut nongentesimo sexagesimo nono vitæ suæ Mathusala mortuus sit, eo anno quo cœpit esse diluvium. Quæst. Hebraic. in Gen. p. 512, 513, Edit. Martianau. The Samaritan Copy of *Jerome* was more uncorrupt than that of *Eusebius*, in which the Centuries abovementioned were taken away, and the Numbers the same with those in our present Copies. Ap. Syncel. Chronog. p. 82, 83.

(78) Quæri solet quomodo Mathusalem secundum annorum computationem vivere post diluvium potuerit, cum omnes præter eos qui in arcam ingressi sunt, periisse dicantur. sed hanc quæstionem plurium codicum mendacitas peperit. non solum quippe in Hebræis aliter invenitur; verum etiam

more correct than the common ones were, to which also he saies one *Latin* and one *Syriac* Copy agreed, which made *Matbuselab* die six Years before the Flood. This *Latin* and *Syriac* Copy were undoubtedly derived from those most ancient *Greek* Copies of the Septuagint, which gave to *Matbuselab* 187 Years to the Birth of *Lamech*, and which we shall see was the original Number both of the *Hebrew* Text and of the Septuagint Version.

Origen was the first, we know of, who espoused that Reading of the Septuagint which gave no more than 167 Years to *Matbuselab* before the Birth of *Lamech*; and caused the Difficulty so much agitated in the Christian Church which used the *Greek* Version of the Scriptures, about the Time of the Death of *Matbuselab*. The true Number was 187, which cleared the Difficulty, and according to the Computation of the Septuagint made *Matbuselab* die six Years before the Flood.

The most ancient *Cottonian* Manuscript had this Number; the *Alexandrian* Manuscript has it; and all those from whence the (79) *Aldine*, *Argentorate*, and *Basil* Copies were deduced, have it. And before the Time of *Origen*, it was in the Copy of (80) *Theophilus* Bishop of *An-*

in LXX. interpretatione *Matbusalem* in codicibus paucioribus, sed veracioribus, sex annos ante diluvium reperitur fuisse defunctus. Quæst. ii. in Genes. init. libri. What these Copies were he tells us, in his book *De Civit. Dei*, lib. xv. c. 13. fin. In quibusdam etiam Codicibus, Græcis tribus, et uno Latino et uno etiam Syro inter se consentientibus inventus est *Mathusalem* sex annis ante Diluvium fuisse defunctus. This shews that the correct Copies he speaks of, gave 187 Years to *Matbuselab* before the Birth of *Lamech*, and 188 Years to *Lamech* before the Birth of *Noah*, and so made *Matbuselab* die six Years before the Flood. Hence we may correct an Error in the preceding Words, viz. Rursus monet, cur in octava generatione antequam de *Mathusale* nasceretur *Lamech*, quum apud Hebræos legantur centum LXXXII. viginti minus inveniuntur in codicibus nostris, ubi potius addi centum solent. Now as the common Copies of the Septuagint, he is speaking of, read 167, it is evident that 20 more added, which he saies were in the *Hebrew* Copies, made the Number not Centum LXXXII. but Centum LXXXVII.

(79) Walton. Prolegom. ad Bibl. Polyglot. p. 67. sect. 57.

(80) Lib. iii. ad Autolyc. where the Number is ρπζ'. 187. and yet soon after, p. 138. he places the Flood in the Year of the World 2242. which supposes the preceding Number to have been 167, and so some Copies have

tioch,

tiob, and other Copies had it in *Origen's* Time, which his cotemporary (81) *Julius Africanus* followed; and the *Chronicon Paschale* (82) saies these were correct Copies.

The *Oriental Chronicle* (83), and the *Alexandrine Annals* of *Eutychius* (84), and the *Ecclesiastical Computation* of *Nicephorus* (85) Patriarch of *Constantinople*, have all the same Number. (86) *Epiphanius* also had this Number. And several Ages before all these *Demetrius* (87) had the same Number in his Copy of the *Septuagint* about 220 Years before the vulgar Christian *Æra*; and which Copy might be taken from the original Manuscript of the *Greek Version*, which was in the *Alexandrian Library*, and had been wrote about sixty five Years before. And as this also was the Number of both the ancient *Samaritan* and *Hebrew Text*, and *Josephus* also had it in his *Hebrew Copy*, it is be-

it. But I think it more probable that the Number 187 is right, and that there is an Error in the numeral Letters of the Sum total, and that instead of βσμϛ', i. e. 2242. *Theophilus* wrote βσξϛ', i. e. 2262. But of this let the learned Reader judge.

(81) τινὰ ἣ τ' ἀν' ἱεράφων τῷ ἑκατοσῷ ὀγδοηκοσῷ ἐβδόμῳ ἔτη αὐτῶ Μαθυσάλα φέρειν τ' ἡλύνησιν Λάμεχ· οἷς καὶ ὁ Ἀφελκανὸς ἀκολυθήσας τῷ διαχιλίοσῳ Ἀφροσίοσῳ ἐξηκοσῷ ὁδύερω ἔτη ἧ κόσμῳ τ' ὅππῃ Νῶε καὶ ἀκλυσμὸν ἐσοιχείωσεν. — δοκεῖ δέ μοι ὁ Ἀφελκανὸς τῷ βσξϛ' [2262] ἔτη ἧ κόσμῳ τ' καὶ ἀκλυσμὸν σοιχειῶσαι Διὰ τὸ τῆς ἐννακοσίης ἐξήκοντα ἐνέα χεῖρας τ' ζωῆς Μαθυσάλα ἀρχομένης ἀπὸ τῆ ἀσπζ' [1287] ἔτης τῆ κόσμῳ λήγειν εἰς τὸ βσνς' [2256] ἔτης (leg. ἔτϙ) τῆ κόσμῳ, ἐνὸς τ' βσξϛ' ἔτων. Apud Syncel. Chronograph. p. 20. also ibid. p. 81, 83. And this shews the gross Error of *Syncellus*, mentioned above in charging *Africanus* with giving to *Mathuselah* 989 Years; which would have carried him 14 Years beyond the Flood; whereas he owns in the Passage above, that by his Computation *Mathuselah* died six Years before the Flood.

(82) ἐν τῷ ἑκατοσῷ ἔτη τῆ Σήμ, ἐξακοσίοσῳ ἣ τῆ Νῶε καὶ βσξϛ' ἔτη ἡλύσεως κόσμῳ ἐγλύετο ὁ καὶ ἀκλυσμὸς ὅππῃ τ' γῆς. ποσαῦτον ἣ μέγχι τ' ἐνλαῦθα καὶ ὁ Ἀφελκανὸς ἐπήγαγν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὰ ἀκλυθῆ τ' ἡλύσεως βιβλία ἔπρζ φαίνε τῆ Μαθυσάλα ἔτη, καὶ ἔως αὐτὸν ἡλύνησαι τ' Λάμεχ. p. 21.

(83) P. 2. and *Chrysostom* had the Number 187. in his Copy, in *Gen. v. Homil. 21.*

(84) P. 28.

(85) Ad fin. *Syncel. Chronograph.*

(86) It appears that *Epiphanius* followed the Copies which had this Number, because he places the Flood in the Year of the World 2262. παρῆλθε δεκάτη ἡμερὰ δι' ἑτῶν διαχιλίων Ἀφροσίων ἐξηκονταδύο. adv. Hæref. lib. i. p. 5.

(87) Ap. *Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ix. c. 21. p. 425.*

yond

yond all doubt that this was the original Number both of the *Hebrew* Text of *Moses*, and of the *Greek* Version of it. And as the Number 167 had passed into so many ancient *Greek* Copies, that the most learned *Origen*, and after him the very learned *Eusebius* was imposed upon by it; it can hardly be supposed to have been an Error of a Transcriber of the *Greek* Version, but rather to have been a designed Corruption of it: and if so, it must have been the Work of the *Hellenist Jews*, and done in order to degrade and expose the *Greek* Version of the LXXII. as being guilty of such an absurd Error as to make *Matbuselah* live fourteen Years after the Flood: whereas they had taken care in their *Hebrew* Copies, corrupted as they were, to let the true Number stand, and to make him die the Year of the Flood.

It has been fully proved above from the original *Hebrew* Numbers of the Years of the antediluvian Patriarchs preserved in *Josephus*, and from which the original *Greek* Numbers differ only six Years; that the *Noachic* Flood commenced in the Year (88) of the World 2256. For it is to be observed, that when it is said in Scripture that *Adam* lived 230 Years and begat his Son *Seth* (and so of the Years of the rest when they begat their Sons) the meaning is, that *Adam* (and so of the rest) was in the 230th Year of his Age when *Eve*, or *Heve*, as she is rightly called, conceived *Seth*, and was aged 230 Years complete when *Seth* was born.

It is the Style of Scripture to say a Person is so many Years old, or lived so many Years, when the particular Year mentioned was begun. So in *Gen. vii. 6.* it is said; *Noah was six hundred Years old when the Flood of Waters was (or came) upon the Earth.* Yet he was really no more than 599 Years old complete, and in the 600th Year of his Age, as is expressly said *vs. 11.* Therefore the Flood began according to the true *Hebrew* Chronology in the Year of the World 2256: and it continued a whole Year from the Beginning to the End of it, from the 27th Day of the second Month in the Year of the World 2256, to the 27th Day of the second Month in the Year of the World

(88) The Reading of the present Copies of *Josephus* is 2656. But as the particular Sums amount to no more than 2250, it is evident that he wrote not διχίλιον ἑξακοσίον πενήκοντα ἕξ. but διχίλιον ἄλφακοσίον πενήκοντα ἕξ, *Antiq. Jud. lib. i. c. 3.*

2257, when *Noah* went out of the Ark; and this was the 601st Year of his Life. *Gen.* vii. 11. viii. 13, 14. I have reckoned the Flood to be exactly a Year, and no more. The *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* Texts make it ten Days longer; in which Copies it is said to begin on the 17th Day of the second Month, and to end the 27th Day of the second Month of the following Year. But I have chose to follow the Number of the Septuagint and *Josephus*, who agree that the Flood began on the 27th Day (89) of the second Month. And the *Latin* Vulgate agrees with the Septuagint in the viiith Chapter and 3^d and 4th Verse, that the End of the 150 Days of the Flood, when the Waters were abated and the Ark rested on one of the Mountains called *Ararat* in (90) *Armenia*, was on the 27th Day of the seventh Month: and therefore the Flood by this reckoning must begin not on the 17th Day, as the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* and Vulgate have it in the viith Chapter and 11th Verse; but on the 27th Day, according to the *Greek* Version here, and as the *Greek* and Vulgate both have it in the viiith Chapter and 4th Verse. And the Number of *Josephus* in this last Place, which is the 7th Day

(89) ἡ δ' ἐπομβρία ἀρχαὶ φασιν (Μωσῆς) τῇ ἐβδόμῃ τῷ προσεμμένῳ μῶντι καὶ εἰκάδι. *ibid.* They read in their *Hebrew* Copies, *Asarim* or *Asrim* (עשרים) in the plural Number, *i. e.* *twentieth*; and the present Copies have *Asar* (עשר) in the singular Number, *i. e.* *tenth*.

(90) It is universally agreed that the Ark rested on a Mountain in *Armenia*, called *Ararat*; and might be one of them which was near the Mouth of the River *Araxes*, and which might have its Name from that River. *Josephus*, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. i. c. 3. tells us, that the *Armenians* called this Mountain *Σαράνιον*, that is by a Name in their Language which signified *Descent*, or the *Mountain of Descent*. And he cites *Berosus* the *Chaldean* Priest of *Belus*, who said that in his Time the Mountain where the Ark rested was thought to be one of the *Cordyæan* or *Gordyæan* Mountains in *Armenia*. And *Syncellus* relates the same from *Berosus*, *Chronograph.* p. 31. *Nicolaus* of *Damascus* wrote, that it was one of the Mountains of *Armenia*, near the *Minyæ*, called *Baris*, a Name given it from the resting of the Ark there. *Apud Jos. ibid.* and see the Notes there. And the oriental Writers agreed that it was one of the *Gordyæan* Mountains. *Abul-Pharajius*, *Dynast.* p. 8. who calls it *Giuda*. The *Nubian* Geographer calls it *Al-Giudi*, p. 202. *Elmacin* calls it *Gurdi*. And *Eutychius*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, calls it *Alluda*, p. 40. *Epiphanius* calls it *Lubar*, and saies it was one of the Mountains of *Ararat*, which lay between *Armenia* and the *Cordyæan* Mountains. *Adv. Hæres.* lib. i. p. 5. See *Bochart. Geog. Sac.* p. 16—21.

of

of the seventh Month, is evidently corrupt, and should be the 27th agreeably to his preceding Number, and his reckoning with the Scripture 150 Days from the 27th Day of the second Month, which must end on the 27th Day of the seventh Month (91).

It is farther to be observed, that the Flood came in the same Season of the Year in which the World was created, *i. e.* in the Spring, and fifty-six Days after the vernal Equinox. So by our present reckoning this Equinox to commence on the 10th of *March*, the Flood began on the 6th Day of *May*. The Account which *Moses* gives of the Deluge is short and plain. He saies, *Gen. vii. 11, 12.* that *all the Fountains of the great Deep were broken up; and the Windows (or Flood-gates) of Heaven were opened: and the Rain was upon the Earth forty Days and forty Nights.* These were the two great Sources of the Deluge. The subterraneous Waters of the Deep or Abyss, wherein was lodged a great Part of the Waters which before the Creation covered the Face of the Earth, *Gen. i. 1.* were let out through Chasms upon the Earth's Surface; and at the same time immense Quantities of Rain poured down from the Firmament or Clouds, where it had been a long time gathering together, and continued forty Days and forty Nights without Intermission, and more or less for 150 Days, as *Moses* intimates *ŷ 24.* This forty Days Rain falling as is represented in Scripture, in Spouts or Cataracts would naturally raise to a great Height the subterraneous Waters which it met breaking out of the Abyss upon the Earth. This is well known to those who have seen such Falls of Waters in Columns called Spouts, in the *East* and *West Indies*, when it is observed that the Waters of the Sea, the outward Compression of the Air being taken from them, rise to meet them, agreeably to the Laws of Nature.

To these were added the Floods of the River *Euphrates*, which in the Beginning of *June* (92), or about the Summer Solstice, being

(91) The solar Year of the *Egyptians*, which *Moses* used, consisted of twelve Months, of Thirty Days each, and five Days were added to the last Month.

(92) ὁ δὲ Εὐφράτης ποταμὸς ὅταν ἐκ τῆς Ἀρμενίας ὁρῶν — ἤρθη ὑπερφαινύσκει καὶ πολὺ ἐν μάλιστα ὑπὸ περὶ αἰσιν τῆς θέρης ὁ ἥλιος ἐπιστρέφει, μέγας τε ἐπέρχει καὶ ὑπερβάλλει ὑπὲρ τὰς ὄχθας εἰς τὴν γῆν τῆς Ἀσσυρίας. τινικαὶ τὰ αἰ χιόνες αἰ
I raised

raised to a great Height by the melted Snow which ran from the Mountains of *Armenia*, used to overflow all the low Lands of *Mesopotamia*, *Babylonia*, *Chaldæa*, and *Sufiana*, where the first Race of Mankind chiefly dwelt.

After 150 Days the Waters began to decrease, which was occasioned by the ceasing of the Rain; and principally by an extraordinary or miraculous Wind, like that which moved upon the Waters at the Beginning of the Creation. This Wind of God *passed over the Earth*, as *Moses* relates in the viiith Chapter and 1st Verse: and by its powerful Energy, as at the Creation, carried off part of the Flood of Waters into the Firmament or Atmosphere whence it came, and drove the other part into the Abyss again, from which it had broke out, and whither it would naturally run back after the ceasing of the Rain; and the Sun would also exhale great Quantities of it in Vapours: so that in the Space of twelve Months, the Earth was every where dried, and brought forth Grass and Fruits as before.

One may with some Probability suppose, that in the Decrease of the Waters of the Deluge Fishes of several Kinds would be left upon Mountains, where their Bones and Shells are still found: and that others would sink with the Waters below the broken Surface of the Earth to several Depths, where their Shells and Bones also are now found. But it is not probable that the Deluge could dissolve the Earth into a fluid State to any Depth: and that Bones and Shells of Fishes and other Animals should thereby become soft, and being mixed with the Substance of Stone reduced to a fluid Matter, should by Degrees harden and petrify, as we see them at this Day. A Deluge has no natural Tendency to produce these Effects; nor are any such Effects intimated to have been then wrought by the miraculous Power of God, which brought the Deluge upon the Earth. So that the fore-mentioned Phænomena may be better accounted for from the Chaos which preceded the Creation or Formation of the Earth. This Chaos was an unformed fluid Mass, covered with Water to a considerable Depth at least: and when

ὅτι τοῖς ὄρεσι τοῖς Ἀρμενίοις καὶ ἀληκόμηναι αὐξάνει αὐτὰ τὸ ὕδωρ ὅτι μέγα. ὅτι ὅτι πολλὰ ἐστὶν αὐτὰ καὶ ὑψηλὰς ὁ ῥῆς ὑπερβάλλει ἐς τὸ χάσμα. Arrian. de Exped. Alex. lib. vii. p. 489, 490.

the Water was separated by the raising of the Earth above it, Bones and Shells of Fishes and other Animals which were dissolved and mixed with the chaotic Matter before the Formation of the present Earth, would naturally be laid in the Tops of Mountains, and also within the Earth, and would there harden in and with the earthy Substance, and petrify as they are found.

I shall now offer some farther Reasons to prove that the present *Hebrew* Numbers, both *Jewish* and *Samaritan*, of the Ages of the Patriarchs from the Creation to the Flood, are erroneous and corrupt.

In the *Jewish Hebrew* Computation, which places the Flood in the Year of the World 1656, we may observe that in the first five Generations, and also in the seventh, there is a whole Century less in the Years before the Patriarchs begat Children, than there is in the Numbers of *Josephus* from his *Hebrew* Copy, and in that from which the LXXII. made their *Greek* Version. Also that there is a great Disproportion and Diffonancy between these and the Numbers of the sixth, eighth, and ninth Generations, which agree to *Josephus*, and also to the *Greek* Numbers, except only in six Years in the Age of *Matbuselah*.

On the other hand, all the Numbers of *Josephus* and the Septuagint are uniform, and shew that the antediluvian Patriarchs began to get Children when they had lived about a fifth Part of their whole Age, which is agreeable to the Course of Nature. But according to the *Hebrew* Numbers, five of the Patriarchs, *Seth*, *Enos*, *Cainan*, *Mela-leel*, and *Enoch* (supposing it probable that he would have lived as long as the other if he had not been translated) began to have Children before they had lived a ninth or tenth Part of their natural Age (just as if Men should now beget Children at seven or eight Years of Age) and much sooner also than several of the Patriarchs after the Flood begat their Children, as we shall see, though they lived not to half the Age of the antediluvian Patriarchs. This is a direct Absurdity against the regular and ever uniform Course of Nature. Besides, no Reason can be given why the before-mentioned should begin to beget Children at 105, 90, 70, and 65 Years of Age, when *Jared* lived 162 Years, *Matbuselah* and *Lamech* lived the one 187 Years and the other 182 Years before they begat Children. And for a farther

strong Confirmation that none of the antediluvian Fathers began to have Children till they were more than an hundred Years of Age, or sooner than the time of their Ages mentioned in *Josephus* and the *Greek* Version, it is remarkable that the three Sons of *Noah*, who were all near an hundred Years old at the Deluge, had not then begun to have Children: and I think it is very probable they had not been long married, or would have been married so young, but that it was necessary for the Propagation of Mankind after the Flood, that they should take Wives with them into the Ark: though yet their lives were far shorter than those of their Forefathers. We find that one of them, *Sem*, had a Son two Years after the Flood, when he was an hundred Years old, *Gen.* xi. 10. But we do not read that the other two Brothers, one of which, *Japhet* seems to have been older than *Sem*, had Children so soon. And surely it is absurd to suppose that these Sons of *Noah* should be older before they begat Children, than several of their Ancestors whose Lives were half as long again.

Another Evidence of the Corruption of the *Hebrew* Copies, is the Disagreement between the Western and Eastern Copies. The Western *Hebrew* Copies all reckon the Flood to commence in the Year of the World 1656. But we are told by an (93) Author of good Credit, that all the *Hebrew* Copies of *Genesis* used by the Eastern *Jews* give no more than 1556 Years to this Period; that is, they placed the Deluge in the Year of the World 1556, and so made the Time a Century less than the Western *Jews* did. Hence it appears that the *Ba-*

(93) Textus autem Hebraici inde patet corruptela, quod a casu Adami ad diluvium computet annos 1556. Ismael Sciahinschiah apud Abrah. Ecchel. Maronit. in Hist. Arab. ad fin. Chron. Orient. Edit. Paris. 1685. p. 172, 173. Upon which Words *Ecchellensis* remarks, viz. Summa seu periodus quam a creatione mundi ad diluvium ex Hebraico textu suæ ætatis quem in Perside, ubi scripsit, consuluit, centum annis ab illa exceditur quam nostra nunc exhibent in occidente exemplaria. Ille tamen non semel testatur non solum se piura evolvisse ejusmodi Hebraica exemplaria, sed etiam Rabbinos et gentis Doctores adhibuisse, quemadmodum fecit quoque ante illum in suo chronico conficiendo Hamadaddinus Ismael princeps Hemat. Ex quo plane colligere est, exemplaria quibus usus est uterque Ismael differre ab iis quæ legunt nunc in Europa Judæi, nec ita sibi ubique constare, ut blaterat et rudit noster Judæus.

bylonian Hebrew Text, which was followed by the Eastern *Jews*, left out a Century in the Age of *Jared* before he begat *Enoch*, which stood in the *Tiberian Hebrew Text*, which was used in *Judæa* and by all the Western *Jews*. The ascribing to *Jared* 62 Years instead of 162 before he begat *Enoch*, without any other Alteration in the Ages of the Patriarchs, makes the Number of the *Hebrew Chronology* from the Creation to the Flood 1556, instead of 1656. And so there is no doubt but the Alteration was made in the Age of (94) *Jared* only before he begat *Enoch*.

Augustine (95) relates that the *Jews* were suspected of having corrupted their Copies, and altered the Periods of the Ages of the antediluvian Patriarchs before and after their begetting Children, out of Envy to the Christians, and to diminish the Authority of the *Greek*

(94) The learned Gentleman who was the Author of *The Dissertation on the Chronology of the Septuagint*, printed at London, 1741, not suspecting the Century wanting in the Eastern *Hebrew Copies* to have been taken from the Age of *Jared*; and supposing it taken either from the Years of *Mathuselah*, or *Lamech*, saies, that *the present Eastern Copies of the Hebrew Text of Genesis must of Necessity differ in some other Ages of the antediluvian Patriarchs from our present Western Copies of the same Text; particularly in the Number of Years that Lamech and Mathuselah lived; for if in those Lamech was made to live 777 Years, and Mathuselah 969 Years, as all our Western Copies do, the former must have survived the universal Deluge 95 Years, and the latter 100 Years, which is absurd to imagine.* p. 8. But this Absurdity is wholly removed by the Century of Years being taken from the Age of *Jared*, before he begat *Enoch*; and then the Eastern *Hebrew Copies* agreed with those *Samaritan Copies*, which left out the Century before *Jared's* Age of begetting *Enoch*, and retained, as *Jerome* found, the present *Hebrew Numbers* of *Mathuselah* and *Lamech* in this Period of their Lives before their having Children. And the learned Author's own Observations, p. 10, 11. might easily have led him to see that the Difference of the Eastern and Western Copies lay where I have supposed it.

(95) Non admittunt, quod magis hic esse potuerit error interpretum, quam in ea lingua esse falsum, unde in nostram per Græcam scriptura ipsa translata est. Sed inquiunt non esse credibile Septuaginta Interpretes, qui uno simul tempore unoque sensu interpretati sunt, errare potuisse; aut ubi nihil eorum intererat, voluisse mentiri: Judæos vero dum nobis invident quod lex et prophetæ ad nos interpretando transferunt, mutasse quædam in codicibus suis, ut in nostris minueretur autoritas. Hanc opinionem vel suspicionem accipiat quisque ut putaverit. De Civ. Dei, lib. xv. c. 11.

Scriptures

Scriptures used by the Christian Church: and that on the other hand the LXX Interpreters could have no Interest or View to serve in deviating from the *Hebrew* Text. *Augustine* (96) himself is not willing to lay the Blame either on the Septuagint Interpreters or on the *Jews*, as having wilfully and maliciously altered the sacred Text: but as the Alteration was plainly deliberate and designed, as the Uniformity of it, he observes, demonstrates; he ascribes it to a first Copier of the *Greek* Version, and supposes it to have been done to make the Time of Puberty more natural and agreeable to the Lives of the Patriarchs. But as the supposed Reason given by *Augustine*, to render the Years of Puberty probable and agreeable to Nature, is a Proof that the Numbers of the Septuagint are right and have not been altered; so it serves to prove that the *Jews*, not regarding the natural and proportionate Time of Puberty to the Term of Life after it, have altered the Numbers, as the ancient Christians thought, to serve other Purposes: had the *Greek* Numbers been originally the same with the present *Hebrew* Numbers, and been industriously altered by some Copier of the Septuagint; this must soon have been discovered. For as there were many Copies taken from the Original at *Alexandria*, which were read in the Synagogues, any Alteration made in the first Copy would immediately be found out by the others, and by comparing them with the *Hebrew* Text: and such an Alteration and Disagreement of the Copies would neither have been endured by the *Greek* or *Hebrew* *Jews*, and could not have lain long undiscovered.

And had *Augustine* been aware that the *Hebrew* Copies agreed with the *Greek* in the Chronology before the Flood, and after to the Time

(96) In his autem in quibus continuatur ipsius mendositatis similitudo, ita ut ante genitum filium qui ordini inseritur alibi supersint centum anni, alibi defint: post genitum autem, ubi deerant supersint, ubi supererant defint, ut summa conveniat; et hoc in prima, secunda, tertia, quarta, quinta, septima generatione invenitur, videtur habere quandam, si dici potest, error ipse constantiam: nec casum redolet sed industriam. Itaque illa diversitas numerorum aliter se habentium in codicibus Græcis et Latinis, aliter in Hebræis — nec malitiæ Judæorum, nec diligentiae vel prudentiae Septuaginta Interpretum, sed scriptoris tribuatur errori, qui de bibliotheca supradicti regis (Ptolomæi) codicem describendum primus accepit, etc. Ibid. c. 13.

of *Christ*, and a Century after, as appears from *Josephus* and other ancient Writers compared together, he could not have doubted but that the *Jews* had wilfully altered the Chronology of their Scriptures in order to bring a Discredit on the Septuagint Version used by the Christians, as not being faithfully taken; and also to confound their Computations of the Time of the coming of *Christ*.

It was much easier for the *Jews*, by the Authority of their Sanhedrim, to whom the whole Body of the People every where would readily submit, to alter the *Hebrew* Scriptures, which were known but to few Christians; than for the Christians to alter the *Greek* Copies which were dispersed in all *Greek* Countries of the *Roman* Empire; and which had they attempted, must immediately have been discovered by the Variation of the Copies; and the *Greek Jews* who used these Copies as well as the Christians, would have been ready to discover the Cheat, and to upbraid the Christians with it, if they had been able: and the Forgery must thereby have been evident to this Day. Whereas therefore it appears that the *Greek* Copies unanimously and uniformly agree in the Years we are considering, and also agreed with the *Hebrew* Text in the first Times of Christianity and in the Time of *Josephus*; whereas also there is not now the same Agreement between the *Hebrew* Copies as there is amongst the *Greek*, there being a Difference of an hundred Years between the Eastern and Western *Hebrew* Copies; since likewise the Variation in the *Hebrew* Copies from the *Greek*, is uniform, so that this Variation must have been made designedly, either in the *Greek* Version or in the *Hebrew* Text, it must be evident to every intelligent and judicious Person, that the Variation was made by the *Jews*, and that the *Hebrew* Copies have been purposely altered by them. This Point, which is of great Importance, will be farther considered. The next thing at present to be observed is the Variation and Corruption of the *Samaritan Hebrew* Text in the Chronology from the Creation to the Flood. The *Samaritan* Period is no more than 1307 Years, which is less than the original *Hebrew* Computation of *Josephus* by 949 Years, and less than the present *Masorete Hebrew* Account by 349 Years: and therefore the *Samaritans* have in this Period corrupted the sacred Text much more than the *Jews* have done.

The

The Reason of the Shortness of the Chronology of the *Samaritan Hebrew* Text is the leaving out the Centuries of Years in the Ages of *Jared*, *Mathuselah*, and *Lamech* before they begat Children, which are left in the Western *Jewish Hebrew* Copies: and making the Age of *Mathuselah* 67 Years instead of 187, and the Age of *Lamech* 53 Years instead of 182, which makes the Difference to be 349 Years. The Age of the *Samaritan Hebrew* Copy, whence the Copies which we have were taken, cannot be certainly known. It does not appear that *Africanus* ever saw it. But *Origen* must have seen and consulted the *Samaritan Hebrew* Text, if the Observations or Notes found in Extracts of the *Hexapla* from the *Samaritan* Text were his, as they (97) seem to be. One of these was taken Notice of above, on *Gen.* v. 25, where the Age of *Mathuselah* when he begat *Lamech* is mentioned from the *Samaritan* Text, and is the same which *Jerome* found in this Text also.

There is another Observation on *Num.* ch. xiii. § 1. where *Origen* says he had added what he found in the *Samaritan* (98) *Hebrew* Text,

(97) *Eusebius* seems to mean that *Origen* had a Copy of the Scriptures wrote in the *Samaritan* Letters, in saying, *that he learned the Hebrew tongue and procured a Copy of the Jewish Scriptures wrote in the original Hebrew Letters.* ἢ Ἐβραϊδα γλωτταν ἐκμαθεῖν τὰς τε παρὰ τοῖς Ἰσθαίοις ἐμφορομήας ΠΡΩΤΟΤΥΠΟΥΣ αὐτοῖς Ἐβραίων σοιχείοις γραφὰς κτῆμα ἴδιον ποιήσας. *Eccles.* Hist. lib. vi. c. 16. *Eusebius* knew that the Original and proper *Hebrew* Letters were those which the *Samaritans* used. And though not many Copies of the *Hebrew* Scriptures wrote in the *Samaritan* Letters probably remained in *Origen's* Time amongst the *Jews*, yet as they were not regarded by the *Jews*, after they used the *Chaldee* Letters, he might easily procure one of these Copies; and it is probable that in the Margin of his *Hexapla* he noted the Differences which he found between that and the *Hebrew* Copy commonly used and wrote in *Chaldee* Letters.

(98) Ο. Καὶ ἐλάλησε κύριος, &c. *Ad Marg. Basiliensis.* Καὶ τῶτων μνημονεύει Μωϋσῆς ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις τῷ Δευτερονομίᾳ ἃ καὶ αὐτὰ ἐκ τῶ Ἑβραίων Ἐβραϊκῶ μετέβαλον καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς τῆς Ο. Ἑρμηνείας τῆς ἐν τῷ Δευτερονομίῳ φερομένη. *Apud Hexapl. Montfaucon.* p. 158. *Montfaucon* says upon the Place, *Hæc Nota Origenis esse videtur: etsi codex Basiliensis, unde illam mutuamur, id non indicet. Monet autem ea quæ sequuntur in Samaritano haberi, ex Deut. i. 20. desumpta; et sane extant quoque in Samaritano hodierno textu, et in versione Samaritana, neque ullatenus ab hac Græca versione discrepant.*

and

and which was also written in the Beginning of Deuteronomy ; and that he had translated the Words of the Samaritan Text into Greek, agreeable to the Version of the Septuagint in the Place of Deuteronomy. And the Passage which Origen translated from the Samaritan is extant in our present Copy of the Samaritan Text in Num. xiii. 1. The Copy which Origen had of the Samaritan Text agreed, as far as appears, with the Jewish Hebrew Numbers, from the Creation to the Flood ; and was altered between his Time and that of Eusebius, or about the End of the third Century, as is probable, to what it has been since, and we now find in the present Copies. The Numbers of the Jewish Hebrew Copies were altered or corrupted all at once ; but the Samaritans altered theirs by Degrees, and at different Times, as is evident from the Copies of Origen and Eusebius.

The Western Hebrew Copies, or those of Judæa, which followed the Copies of the School of Tiberias, retained the Century of Years in the Age of Jared before he begat Children ; but the Eastern or Babylonian Copies left it out, because the adding it to his remaining Years was consistent with his dying before the Flood, whilst the Centuries stood before the Ages of Matbuselah and Lamech, which lengthned the Term of the Flood to the Year of the World 1556. Therefore the Samaritan in this Correction of the Age of Jared, followed the Order of the Eastern Copies. The Jews had a Mind to have left out a Century in the Ages of all the Patriarchs before they begat Children, and to have added it to the after-Term of their Lives : but they found, that if they dropped the Centuries of the Ages of Jared, Matbuselah, and Lamech, before they begat Children, as they had done of all the rest, and added them to the Remainder of their Lives, they must by this Reckoning have extended their Lives beyond the Flood, contrary to the History of Scripture. The Flood would have been placed in the Year of the World 1356, and Jared, who was born in the Year 460, and lived 962 Years, would have died in the Year 1422, which would have been 66 Years after the Flood. Matbuselah would be born by the same Computation in the Year 587, and living 969 Years, would have died in the Year 1556, and 200 Years after the Flood. Lamech also would be born in the Year 674, and having lived 777 Years, would die

die in the Year 1451, which is 95 Years after the Flood. On this Account the *Jews* not daring to shorten the Lives of their Patriarchs, left the original Numbers standing before *Mathuselah* and *Lamech*; and the Western *Jews* also before *Jared*: though they took away the Century before *Enoch*, and added it to the rest of his Age after he begat Children, because his Life was not half so long as any of the rest of the *Antediluvians*, he being translated into Heaven when he had lived 365 Years. The *Samaritans* at first ventured not to shorten the Years of the Lives of *Jared*, *Mathuselah*, and *Lamech*, but only took away an hundred Years of the Age of *Jared* before he begat Children and added them to the remaining Term of his Life, as the Eastern *Jews* also had done, and thus their Copies stood, as is probable, in the Time of *Origen*, and several of them remained in the Time of *Jerome*. But after the Time of *Origen* they grew less scrupulous, and took away a Century from the Age of all the *Antediluvian* Patriarchs before they begat Children, that the whole Genealogy might be uniform: and then that none of them might live beyond the Flood, they shortened the Remainder of their Lives. And by taking off 20 Years more than a Century from the first Part of the Life of *Mathuselah*, and 29 more than a Century from that of his Son *Lamech*, they reduced the Period of the Flood to the Year of the World 1307. Thus by their Computation, as it was corrected, *Jared* was born in the Year 460, and having 15 Years detracted from the latter Part of his Life, died after he had lived 847 Years, in the Year of the World 1307, which was made the Year of the Flood. *Mathuselah* was born in the Year 587 and lived 720 Years to the Year of the Flood 1307, whereby his Age was shortened 249 Years. *Lamech* was born in the Year 654, and lived 653 Years, that is, to the Year 1307, as before. This is the Chronology of our present *Samaritan* Copies, in which the Ages of the three before-mentioned Patriarchs are evidently shortened on purpose to avoid the Absurdity of their surviving the universal Deluge.

Eusebius (99) observed that the *Samaritan* Copy made the three Patriarchs before-mentioned die in the Year of the Flood, which shews

(99) *Ap. Syncel. Chronograph.* p. 83.
VOL. I.

that the Numbers stood in his Time as we find them in the present *Samaritan Hebrew* Text. That the Years of *Jared*, *Mathuselah*, and *Lamech* have been altered and shortened on purpose in the *Samaritan* Copies, is evident not only from their entire Disagreement in the Ages of these Patriarchs with all the Copies both of the *Greek* Version, and also of the *Jewish Hebrew* Text, but also from their exact Agreement in the Years of all the rest of the Antediluvian Patriarchs with the *Greek* and *Jewish Hebrew* Copies.

One great Absurdity attending this short Chronology of the present *Samaritan* Copies is, that they make *Noah* who was the tenth in Descent from *Adam* to live 223 Years with him. Another Absurdity in the *Samaritan* Chronology is, that it supposes some of the Antediluvian Patriarchs to be of Maturity to beget Children when they were arrived to the 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th Part of their Age or under ; which is contrary to the Course of Nature, and as if Men now should beget Children at six, seven, or eight Years of Age. This has been taken Notice of with Respect to the *Jewish Hebrew* Chronology ; but it is more absurd and contradictory in the *Samaritan*, than it is in the *Hebrew* Chronology, because the *Samaritan* supposes the Patriarchs after the Flood, from *Arphaxad* to *Abraham*, not to beget Children till they were older and even double the Age of many of the Antediluvians, and yet their Lives were not half so long as those of their antediluvian Forefathers, and who consequently came to Maturity much sooner than their Ancestors. For in the Genealogies after the Flood, the *Samaritan* agrees with the *Septuagint* in the natural Proportion of Life before the begetting Children, to the Remainder of Years after, with Respect to the first four Generations ; but by following the *Hebrew* Numbers of the Term of the Lives of the four next succeeding, it has varied very absurdly from this Proportion, and supposed *Peleg*, *Rex* or *Ragu*, *Serug* and *Nahor* not to beget Children till they had lived above half their Days.

The great and wilful Corruptions in the *Samaritan* Copies, as well as the lesser in the *Hebrew* Copies in the Times before the Flood, are unpardonable, and cannot but justly throw a Discredit on them. The *Samaritans* at first copied the Corruptions of the *Jews* in the ante-

diluvian Ages, and afterwards improved them by adding others to them.

But by the good Providence of God the faithful *Septuagint* Translation of the Books of *Moses* made many Years before any Corruptions were introduced into them by the Malice of the *Jews* against Christians, or even before they were so much as thought on; and also the invaluable Works of the faithful and most learned *Jewish* Historian *Josephus* wrote also before these Corruptions were made in the sacred Scriptures, do agree in delivering to us the genuine Account of the Period from the Creation to the universal Deluge to the great Confirmation of the Truth of that Period, and the Advancement of sacred Knowledge in Matters of the highest Antiquity and the History of the first Ages of the World; which without these Writings must have been past Discovery.

What has been already observed is sufficient Evidence that the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* Computations from the Creation to the Flood are erroneous and corrupt, and neither agree with one another, nor with the *Hebrew* Copy of *Josephus*, nor with the original Text of the *Septuagint* Version: and are also attended with several Absurdities. But I shall farther add the Testimonies of the ancient *Jews* against the Computations of their present corrupt Copies, and in Defence of the *Septuagint* Version.

We have the Testimony of a very ancient *Jewish* Book ascribed to the antediluvian Patriarch *Enoch*; and which Book is certainly older than the Christian *Æra*; and probably near as old, if not older, than the *Septuagint* Translation itself, and is referred to by *Eupolemus* (100) and the Apostle *Jude* *ŷ* 14, and *St. Peter*, 2 Epist. ii. 4, and by many of the most ancient Christian Writers.

(100) Τῆ Ενώχ γενέσθαι υἱὸν Μαθυσάλαν, ὃν πάντα δι' αἰγέλων Θεῶ γνῶναι, καὶ ἡμᾶς ἔτινος ἐπιγνῶναι. *Euseb. Præp. Ev. lib. ix. c. 17. p. 419. Mathusalah was the Son of Enoch, who was instructed in all Things by the Angels of God, and hence we received the Knowledge of them.* A large Account of these ancient Traditions supposed to be delivered by Angels to *Enoch*, is found in the Book ascribed to him. Though this Book was justly thought *Apocryphal* and to be mixed with Fables, yet it contains many Things of Note and of the highest Antiquity, and was esteemed by the primitive Christian Writers. The oldest Author which mentions it, after *Eupolemus*, that we know of, was *Alexander Polyhistor* about 90 Years before the Christian *Æra*, from whom

60 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

In an Abstract of this Book preserved by *Syncellus*, we are told that the *Eggregori* who were Descendants of *Setb*, called (1) *Sons of God*, *Gen. vi. 2.* came down from the (2) high Country of *Eden*, where they

Syncellus has preserved large Extracts. It is frequently cited in an ancient Book wrote in the first Century by a *Jewish* Christian, and called *The Testament of the twelve Patriarchs*. The Apostolic Constitutions say it was wrote by an *ancient Author*, meaning a *Jewish*, lib. vi. c. 16. p. 348. It is cited by *Clemens of Alexandria*, in the latter End of the second Century, *Eclog. Script. Prophet.* p. 801, 808. *Tertullian*, who wrote about the same Time with *Clemens*, maintains the Genuineness of this Book. Cum *Enoch* eadem scriptura etiam de Domino prædicarit, a nobis quidem nihil omnino rejiciendum est, quod pertinet ad nos. — Eo accedit, quod *Enoch* apud *Judam* Apostolum testimonium possidet. *De habitu mulieb.* c. 3. He cites it also, *De cult. sæm.* c. 10. and *De Idololat.* c. iv. 15. *Origen*, in the third Century cites it with Approbation, though he does not reckon it an authentic Book of Scripture. Ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίαις ἔκ τινος φέρεται ὡς θεῖα τὰ ἐπιγεγραμμένα δ' Ἐνώχ βιβλία. *Cont. Gels.* lib. v. p. 267. *Edit. Spens.* Ὡς ἐν τῷ Ἐνώχ γέγραπται, εἰ τῷ φίλον ᾠθεῖν χεῖρας ὡς ἄγιοι τὸ βιβλίον. *Com. in Joan.* p. 132. He speaks favourably of it in his 28th Homily on *Numbers*, and cites it several Times in his Books *De princip.* *Augustine* mentions this Book, but rejects it as fabulous, *De Civ. Dei*, lib. xv. c. 23. lib. xviii. c. 38. *Jerome* says, *Judas frater Jacobi* parvam, quæ de septem Catholicis est, epistolam reliquit, et quia de libro *Enoch*, qui apocryphus est, in ea assumit testimonium, a plerisque rejicitur; tamen auctoritatem vetustate jam et usu meruit, et inter sanctas scripturas computatur. *Catalog. Script. Ecclesiast.*

(1) Ὅς ὠνόμασεν ἁγγέλος Θεῶν, ἔχι ἐκ τῶν ἔργων, ἅπαγε — τῆς δ' ἀνθρώπου παλαιῶν ὀνομαστὴς καὶ σαρκίος καὶ θνήσκων· φησὶ γὰρ [*Gen. vi. 3.*] Διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸς σάρκας — ὅτι τὸ ἐκλεκτὸν γένος δ' Σὴθ ἁγγέλοι δ' Θεῶν ᾠθεῖν δ' Μωϋσέως ὠνόμασθαι, αὐτὴ ἡ γένεσις διδάξει. The Author adds Οὗτοι ἔν οι δ' Σὴθ ἁγγέλοις ὁμοιωθέντες καὶ ἀγγελικὸν ὕμνον ὁμιλεσάμενοι ἐκείνοις τοῖς ἀποβλήταις δ' Καὶν σωήθησαν, καὶ τὸ θεῖον ᾠργίσθη. *Cbron. Paschal.* p. 22.

Αὐτὸς δὲ (Σὴθ) καὶ οἱ ἐξ αὐτῶν γεννώμενοι ἐχέγοντες καὶ υἱοὶ Θεῶν γινόμενοι. *Cedren. Histor. Compend.* p. 7. *Edit. Basil.* and *Suidas* says; Ὅι δ' Σὴθ καὶ Ἐνὼς καὶ Ἐνώχ παῖδες υἱοὶ Θεῶν ἐκείσθων· οἵτινες ἀλόγους ἀκολασίαν πρὸς τὰς θυγατέρας Καὶν εἰσηλθόντες ἐξ ὧν οἱ ἐκ τῶν καὶ ἀπαλήλων μαιγαμίας γίνονται γίγαντες, &c. *voce* Μαιγαμίας. The learned Editor of *Suidas* reads; Ἐξ ἧς ἀκατακλήτου μαιγαμίας, &c. but the true Reading, I think, is, Ἐξ ὧν τῆς (or ἐκ τῆς) καὶ ἀπαλήλων μαιγαμίας, &c. that is, from whose mutual polluted Intermarriages Giants were born. See *in voce* Σὴθ.

(2) *Cedrenus* says that the Descendants of *Setb* inhabited the higher Country of *Eden*, near to *Paradise*, where they led an Angelical Life till the 1000th Year of the World, when they were smitten with the Beauty of the

dwelt,

dwelt, in the Days of *Jared*, and fell in Love with the beautiful Daughters of Men, viz. of the Family of *Cain* who dwelt in the low Parts of the Country of *Sufiana*, and took them for Wives. And the Time(3) when they took their Wives is said to be in the 1170th Year of the World. This is utterly inconsistent with the *Hebrew* Chronology, which makes *Jared* to be born in the Year of the World 460, and his Son *Enoch* was born 162 Years after, in the Year of the World 622. So according to the *Hebrew* Chronology, this Descent of the *Eggori* could not be in the Days of *Jared*, or before he had a Son born unto him, nor even before the Days of *Noah*. The Scripture Computation is contained in the Years of the Patriarchs when they begat their Sons without regarding the Sum of their whole Lives, as *Josephus* (4) rightly observes. Now according to the *Greek* Chronology, it was from the Creation to the Birth of *Jared* 960 Years, and to the Birth of *Enoch* the Son of *Jared* 1122 Years, which Sum wants only 48 Years of the Time before-mentioned from the Book of *Enoch*. But the Word [ἐκατοσῶ] denoting an *hundred* is undoubtedly an Interpolation of the Text. *Africanus* (5) read it 1070. For he says that in the Year of the World 1077, the *Eggori* committed Whoredom with Women *openly*; so they began before to practise it, but then were arrived to the Height of their Wickedness. Others (6)

Daughters of Men descended from *Cain*. *Histor. Compend.* p. 7. so that righteous *Seth*, whose Sons were distinguished for their Piety and Zeal in the Worship of the true God, by the Appellation of *Sons of God*, lived to see his Descendants, in the fourth Generation, degenerated and corrupted by their forbidden Alliances with the Posterity of wicked *Cain*: when about the Year of the World 1073, they set up a lawless Tyranny in the Countries of *Babylonia* and *Chaldea*, and from thenceforth lived in an impious and dissolute Manner amongst the *Cainites*, till God destroyed them all (*Noah's* Family excepted) by an universal Deluge of Water.

(3) Ἐν τῷ χίλις ἑκατοσῶ ἐβδομηκοσῶ ἔτι δὲ κόσμος ἔλαβον ἑαυτοῖς γυναῖκας, &c. *Syncel. Chronograph.* p. 12.

(4) Ταῦτα συναγόμενα τὰ ἔτη τὸ προαναγεγραμμένον συμπληροῖ χρόνον. ἐξετάζεται δὲ μηδεὶς τὰς τελευτάς τῶν ἀνδρῶν τοῖς γὰρ αὐτῶν παῖσι καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνων ἀπογόνους συμπαραξέτεινον τὸ βίον. ἀλλὰ τὰς γενέσεις αὐτῶν μόνον ὁρᾷτω. *Antiq. Jud. lib. i. c. 3.*

(5) *Apud Syncel. Chronograph.* p. 19.

(6) *Syncel. Chronograph.* p. 16.

read 1058, and the learned *Egyptian* Monk and great Chronologer (6) *Panodorus*, who wrote in the Beginning of the fifth Century, says the *Egregori* descended in the 1000th Year of the World, (and so says *Syncellus* himself) and set up their Tyranny in the Year of the World 1058, where *Panodorus* begins the *Egyptian* Dynasty of Gods. From all which Testimonies it is evident that the numeral Word signifying *an hundred*, was not in the true Copy of *Enoch*, and is inconsistent with the Descent of the *Egregori* or Sons of *Setb* being in the Days of *Jared*, and places it in the Days of his Son *Enoch*, according to the Scripture Computation. But all the foregoing Testimonies agree that it was in the Days of *Jared*, that is, before the Birth of his Son *Enoch*: and so the true Reading of the Book of *Enoch* is, that the *Egregori* came down from the higher Parts of the Country where they inhabited, and had been separated from the Descendants of wicked *Cain*, and took Wives of the Daughters of Men in the 1070th Year of the World, which was the 110th Year of *Jared*, and fifty two Years before he (7) begat *Enoch*. Now from *Jared* to the Flood, the *He-*

(6) *Ibid.* p. 41, and p. 11. and *Abul-Pbarajius*, *Hist. Dynast.* p. 6. says that this Descent happened in the 1000th Year of the World, and the 40th of *Jared*. *Epiphanius* says it was in the Days of *Jared*. *Advers. Hæres.* lib. i. p. 4. *Cedrenus* placeth the Descent in the 1000th Year of the World, and the 40th of *Jared*. *Histor. Compend.* p. 7. *Josephus* placeth this Descent of the Sons of God after the 7th Generation, and supposeth them to be *Angels*. *Antiq. Jud.* lib. i. c. 3.

(7) After the Marriages of the Posterity of *Setb* with the *Cainites*, and their setting up a tyrannical instead of the patriarchal Government; the Descendants of *Setb* began to degenerate and fall off from their primitive Piety, and to imitate the Apostasy of the *Cainites*; and Injustice, Violence, and Wars ensued. *Enoch*, who continued to worship God after the pious Example of his Forefathers, foresaw that the Degeneracy and Unrighteousness which generally prevailed in his Days would bring down the Judgments of God upon the whole Race of Mankind, as is intimated in a Prophecy ascribed to him, and cited by *St. Jude* x 14, 15. Therefore he opposed their Wickedness and Impieties, and preached Repentance to them. *Ecclus.* xlv. 16. But when they despised his Preaching, and, as is probable, persecuted him for his Integrity, Virtue, and Zeal for the Worship of God, as *Abab* and *Jezebel* did *Elijah*, God delivered him from their Violence, by translating him, as he afterwards did *Elijah*, into Heaven.

brew Chronology agrees to the *Septuagint* within one hundred Years : so that this ancient Testimony out of the Book of *Enoch* is a great Confirmation of the Truth of the *Greek* Chronology of Scripture, and that the *Hebrew* Chronology originally agreed with it.

Another Passage of this ancient Book cited from *Alexander Polyhistor*, farther confirms the Chronology of the *Septuagint*, where it is said, that in the 165th Year of *Enoch*, which was in the Year of the World 1286, the Arch-angel *Uriel*, who presided over the Stars, discovered to *Enoch* (8) *what the Month was, and the tropical Year*. This agrees exactly to the *Greek* Chronology.

Another Evidence of the Truth of the *Greek* Chronology of Scripture, may be inferred from the ancient Book called the *Testament* of the XII Patriarchs. It is said in the Testament of *Benjamin*, that *Cain* (9) was 200 Years old when his Afflictions began (after he was driven from the Presence of God for the Murder of his Brother) and this being before the Birth of *Seth*, confirms the *Septuagint* Computation, that *Adam* was 230 Years old when *Seth* was born.

The old *Jewish* Traditions contained in the Book of *Enoch*, seem to be a Remain of older Traditions handed down from the Time of the Flood, concerning the first Beginning of a Kingdom in *Chaldæa*, set up by the antediluvian Giants (10) so called *Gen. vi. 1, 4.* and it is remarkable that the Time of the first antediluvian King of *Chaldæa* called *Al-Orus* by *Berosus*, and also of the first *Egyptian* God-King, supposed to reign in *Egypt*, and called *Vulcan* by *Manetho*, begins at the the Æra of this old traditional Account of the Descent of the *Egregori* or Descendants of *Seth*, and the History of the Giants there mentioned, who were born of their Marriages with the *Cainites*. It agrees also to the Age of *Tubal Cain*, who was called *Chrysor*, by the *Phœnicians*

(8) *Synce.* p. 33.

(9) *Sect. 7. p. 248.* where *Δακωσίων ἐτῶν πάχει*, should be *Δακωσίων ὧν ἐτῶν πάχει*. *Apud Grab. Spicileg. Patr. Tom. I.*

(10) The old Paschal Chronicle makes the antediluvian Giants to be the first Kings of *Chaldæa*. Παρὰ μὲν Χαλδαίοις πρῶτον ὁ ἄρχας αὐτῶν Ἀλωρ — Καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἄρχαιες αὐτῶν. Τέτρες ἡμίξαιο ἡ γρηφὴ λέγεται οἱ Γίγαντες οἱ ἀπ' αἰῶν — οἱ ἀνθρώποι οἱ ὀνομαστοί. p. 23.

64 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

interpreted *Hephæstus* or *Vulcan*; and whose Name was of the same Import with the *Phœnician* and *Greek Chryſor* and *Hephæstus* or *Vulcan*, and the *Chaldæan Al-Orus*. And he might be the first Giant-King before the Flood, and began to reign in the Year of the World 1073 and 1183 Years before the Flood, in which Year the *Egyptian* Dynasties of *Manetho*, and the *Chaldæan* of *Berosus* began. This is a Point of great Importance in the most ancient Part of Chronology hitherto unknown; and it shall be sufficient to hint it only here, but it will be more distinctly and fully considered in another Place of this Work where it will more properly occur.

We may add to the foregoing Evidence for the Truth of the Chronology of the *Septuagint*, what the learned *Selden* relates from a Manuscript Copy of *Eutychius's* Annals, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, viz. That the Eastern Nations had an ancient received Tradition, that *Seth* died in the 20th Year of *Enoch*; and that *Enos* died in the 53^d Year of *Matbusalab*; both which agree exactly with the Chronology of the *Septuagint*, but widely disagree with that of our present *Hebrew* Copies. (11)

Abraham (12) *Eccbellensis* a learned *Syrian Maronite*, chargeth the *Jews* with having corrupted the Chronology of their Scriptures, upon

(11) See a learned Dissertation on the Chronology of the *Septuagint* printed at *London*, A. D. 1741. 8vo. p. 19. and *Selden. De An. civili vet. Jud. c. viii. p. 51. Edit. Lugd. Bat. 1683.*

(12) Ad corruptelam illam in ætatum patriarcharum numeros investam quod attinet, potius *Judeorum* malitiæ, ne pauperem *Messiam* præter spem et genium reciperent, confidenter adscribenda est juxta *Orientalium omnium auctorum opinionem*, quam LXX interpretibus; quod quidem ex iis quæ *Rabbinorum* antiquissimi perhibent de *Adami* ætate ante genitum *Seth* clarissime evincitur. In *Beresib Raba*, qui liber est maximæ authoritatis apud ipsos *Judeos*, tradunt *Rabbini Adamum* ab *Eva* uxore abstinuisse post *Abelis* necem annos 130, quibus elapsis, cognovit eam iterum, quæ concipiens peperit ei *Seth*: ex his autem videntur *Judei* putare annos *Adami* a morte *Abelis* ad nativitatem *Seth* solum, rejectis iis qui necem illam antecesserunt. Hanc receptissimam *Hebræorum traditionem* citant *R. Moſes Ægyptius*, in more *Nebochim*, lib. i. c. 7. *Midras Tanchuma* five *Jelammedenu*, *R. Selomo* in *Gen. iv. 25. Elas* in *Tbisbi* voce *Lilith*, et alii; at quis cordatus et intellectu præditus facile sibi persuadebit, eodem *Adami* creationis anno *Cai um* et *Abel* genitos fuisse, ac eodem anno contigisse fratricidium? Necessario igitur sequitur
the

the Testimonies of their most ancient Rabbi's, who affirmed that *Adam* abstained from his Wife *Heve*, after the Death of *Abel*, 130 Years ; after which they said, he knew her again, and begat *Seth* of her. Now it follows from this ancient Tradition of the Eastern *Jews*, how groundless soever it be, that they believed *Adam* lived more than 130 Years to the Birth of *Seth*. And it is observable that other ancient *Jewish* Traditions tell us that *Abel* was slain by his Brother *Cain* in the 99th Year of the World. The *Small Genesis* (13), cited by *Syncellus*, relates from ancient *Jewish* Tradition, that *Cain* was born in the 70th Year of *Adam's* Life ; and *Abel* in the 77th. That in the 97th Year of the World *Cain* brought his Sacrifice ; and in the 99th Year *Abel* offered his to God, being in the 22^d Year of his Age ; and that in the same 99th Year of the World *Cain* slew his Brother *Abel*.

By this Account *Abel* was slain in the 99th Year of the World ending ; and *Adam* lived after 130 Years when he begat *Seth* ; therefore *Seth* was born when *Adam* was 230 Years old, exactly agreeable to the Chronology of the Septuagint.

Though this Argument seems to affect the *Jews* only, as being founded on their ancient Traditions ; yet it plainly shews that the present *Masoret* Copies have been altered, and the *Hebrew* Chronology much shortened from what it was in the ancient *Hebrew* Copies, from whose Chronology these Traditions were derived.

I proceed to the Consideration of the *Hebrew*, *Samaritan*, and *Greek* Chronology, and also of *Josephus*, after the Flood to the Birth of *Abraham* ; whence it will appear most evident, that the *Jewish Hebrew* Computation is equally corrupt in this Interval as in the preced-

Adamum cum genuit *Seth*, ætate majorem fuisse quam 130 annorum, quos ipsi tribuit præsens *Judæus Textus* a sua creatione ad nativitatem *Seth* ; et sane multo vero similis est ex illius temporis conditione *Abelem* vita defunctum fuisse annos agentem 100, qui additi annis 130, quibus *Adam* abstinuit ab *Eca* post illam necem, consent anni 230, quos *Adamo* lxx editio tribuit. Huic opinioni de abstinentia *Adami* eo temporis intervallo *Orientales omnes* adstipulantur. *Hist Orient. Supplement.* p. 175. To this may be added the Words of the *Jerusalem Targum*, viz. Cognovit *Adam* rursus uxorem suam, exactis centum et triginta annis postquam interfectus est *Habel*. In loc. *Gen.* iv. 25.

(13) Chronograph. p. 8, 9.

VOL. I.

K

ing

66 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

ing from the Creation to the Flood. And the Corruption of the *Hebrew* Chronology is of more Consequence in this second *Æra* of the World, as it makes the Scripture History utterly absurd and inconsistent with itself and with all other Histories of ancient Times.

A Genealogical Table of the Patriarchs from the Flood to Abraham, from the Hebrew and Samaritan, the Septuagint and Josephus. Gen. xi.

<i>Lived Years before the Son's Birth.</i>					<i>After the Son's Birth.</i>			<i>Length of Lives.</i>		
	<i>Heb</i>	<i>Sam</i>	<i>LXXII</i>	<i>Jos.</i>	<i>Heb.</i>	<i>Sam</i>	<i>LXXII</i>	<i>Heb</i>	<i>Sam</i>	<i>LXXII.</i>
	100	100	100	100	500	500	^a 500	600	600	600
<i>Sem, 2 Years after the Flood</i>	2	2	2	[*] 2						
<i>Arphaxad</i>	35	135	135	135	403	303	^b 403	438	438	538
<i>Sala</i>	30	130	130	130	403	303	^c 303	433	433	433
<i>Eber</i>	34	134	134	134	430	270	^d 270	464	404	404 or 564
<i>Peleg, or Phaleg</i>	30	^e 130	^e 130	130	^f 209	109	209	239	239	339
<i>Reu, or Ragu</i>	32	132	132	130	^g 207	107	207	239	239	339
<i>Serug</i>	30	130	130	132	200	100	^h 200	230	230	330
<i>Nabur</i>	29	79	ⁱ 79	129	119	69	^k 129	148	148	208
<i>Terah</i>	70	70	^l 70	70	135	75	^m 135	205	145	205
<i>Years from the Flood to Abraham</i>	292	942	942	992						
			1072							

This Number 1072 is the true Sum of the Septuagint Computation from the Flood to *Abraham*; because it adds *Cainan* between.

* *Josephus*, in his present Copies, makes *Sem* beget *Arphaxad* 12 Years after the Flood, contrary to the *Hebrew*, *Samaritan*, and *Greek* Copies: so that it is certain he wrote 2 Years, as the other Copies have it. And the Error seems to be owing not to a designed Corruption of his Text, but to the Negligence of the Transcriber.

But a real and great Corruption is found in his Text in the Words immediately preceding his Genealogy from the Flood to *Abraham*. It is said that *Abraham* was born in the Year after the Flood 292. This Alteration of the Sum of *Josephus* was made by some ignorant Scribe, and probably a *Jew*, in order to reconcile it to the present *Hebrew* Text. But the Fraud is plainly discovered by the particular Numbers of the several

Arphaxad

Arphaxad and *Sala*, and gives him to the Birth of *Sala* 130 Years, and after that 330 Years, and in all 460 Years. But this Generation will be distinctly considered, and proved to be genuine.

Ages remaining unaltered. The Falsifier found the total Sum to be in his Copy 992 (129 Years being given to *Nabor* before he begat *Terah* in some Copies, as 120 are in others, and both which are evidently wrong,; and 129 is the Term he lived after the Birth of *Terah*.) And this Sum he could easily make 292, by altering only one numeral Letter, viz. ς, which signified 900, into C, which signified 200. The learned *Bernard* observed, that the Number 992 was read in a *Gallican* Ms. of *Josephus*, as he found in the Commentary of *Petit*, viz. δὲ λέγει δ' ἔτι καὶ ἐν ἑλληνιστῶν πρὸς ἐννεακιστοῖς. Not. in *Antiq. Jud. Josephi*, lib. i. c. 6. p. 26. and so *Noldius* read it. *ibid.*

^a The *Aldine* Copy has 335. But all the other *Greek* Copies have 500, in which Number the *Hebrew*, *Samaritan*, *Chaldee* Paraphrase, *Vulgate Latin*, *Syriac*, and *Arabic* Versions all agree.

^b The *Roman* Copy has 400. The *Complute* and *MS. Alex.* 430. The *Aldine* Copy has 330, and so the *Paschal Chronicle*. The *Chald. Par. Syncellus*, p. 78. and the *Oriental Chronicle*, and *Bede*, 430. And so *Eusebius*, in his *Chron.* p. 9. But in *Syncellus* the Copy of *Eusebius* has 403, which I take to be the true Number.

^c The *Roman* Copy has 330, and so the *MS. Alex.* and *Syncel.* p. 115. and the *Oriental Chronicle*. The *Cottonian* and *Oxford MSS.* have 230. The *Complute* 334. *Euseb.* in *Chron.* has 300. But the *Hebrew*, *Samaritan*, *Vulgate*, *Chaldee* Paraphrase, *Syriac*, and *Arabic* all agree in giving to *Sala* 433 Years: and so 303 after the Birth of *Eber*, which is the *Samaritan* Number, is the true Number of the *Septuagint*.

^d The *MS. Alex. Edit. Ald. and Comp.* have 370. The *Heb. Vulg. Chald. Par. Syr. Arab.* have all 430. and *Eusebius* has the same Number 430, both in his *Hebrew* and *Greek* Copy. *Ap. Syncel.* p. 86, 87. so this may be the true Number. But *Eusebius* in his *Chronicon* has 270, with the *Roman* Copy and *Samaritan* Text; and the *Paschal* and *Oriental Chronicles* have the same Number; and therefore I have chose this Number as the genuine Number of the *Septuagint*. But the learned Reader must judge whether the Sum total 404 or 564, which I have also added, be the true Number of the Age of *Eber*.

^e *Peleg* has 130 Years before he begat *Reu.* or *Ragu*, in *Josephus*, the *Samaritan* Text, and all the *Greek MSS.* and Copies, except the *Complute*, which gives him 134 Years; with which Number *Moses Chorenensis* in his *Armenian History* agrees. But *Eusebius* and all the *Greek Writers* have 130, which is undoubtedly the true Number.

^f The *Heb. Samar. Chald. Par. Syr. Vulg. Arab.* all agree in giving to *Peleg* no more than 239 Years. But as they all (except the *Samaritan*) give to

Concerning the Computations of the Samaritan and Septuagint from the Flood to Abraham, and the Genealogy of Cainan.

The Computations or Chronology of those two Copies are exactly the same, excepting that the Generation of *Cainan* is left out in the

Paleg 209 Years after he begat *Reu*, or *Ragu*, as the Septuagint does, it is most probable that he lived 339 Years, according to the *Greek* Computation. And this is the Number of *Africanus* and *Eusebius*, the *Paschal* and *Oriental Chronicles*, and the *Alexandrian Annals* of *Eutychius*, p. 56. and also of *Syncellus*, p. 85, 86.

^a The Number 207 after *Reu*, or *Ragu*, begat *Serug* is fixed by all the *Greek MSS.* and Editions, to which the *Heb. Vulg. Chald. Par. Syr. Arab.* agree. This is also the Number of *Eusebius* and the *Paschal* and *Oriental Chronicles*, and the *Alexandrian Annals* of *Eutychius*: and it was also the Number of the *Samaritan Copy* of *Eusebius*, apud *Syncel.* p. 88. and therefore the Number of the present *Samaritan Copy*, which is 107, is undoubtedly wrong, though I have not chose to alter it.

^b The *Heb. Vulg. Chald. Par. Syr. Arab.* agree with all the *Greek MSS.* and Editions, that *Serug* lived 200 Years after the Birth of *Nabor*. And this is the Number of *Eusebius*, and of the *Paschal* and *Oriental Chronicles*, and *Alexandrian Annals, etc.* and therefore the *Samaritan Number* 100, which was also in the *Samaritan Copy* of *Eusebius* in *Syncellus*, p. 88. is undoubtedly wrong.

^c The *Roman* and *Complute* Copies give to *Nabor* 179 Years to the Birth of *Terab*: and *Moses Chorenensis* has the same Number in his *Armenian History*, p. 11. But the Number 79 is fixed by the *Alexandrian MS.* and *Aldine Edit.* and the *Samaritan Text*, which in the Copy of *Eusebius* in *Syncellus* p. 88. had also the same Number. *Theophilus* Bishop of *Antioch* in the second Century had the same Number; but by an Error of the Transcriber, *cc* i. e. 75, is wrote for *cc* i. e. 79. This also is the Number of *Africanus* in *Syncellus* p. 86, and of *Eusebius*; the *Paschal* and *Oriental Chronicles*, and also the *Chronicon* of *Bede*, and the *Alexandrian Annals* of *Eutychius*, and the *Chronography* of *Nicephorus* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and the *Greeks* in general have this Number. And this was the Reading of *Demetrius*, as appears from his Computation from the Flood to *Abraham*, so that no Doubt can be made of the Genuineness of this Number. And besides it is highly improbable that *Nabor* should not beget Children till he was 179 Years old, when all his Predecessors, some of whose Lives were more than double in Years to his, began to beget Children many Years sooner.

^d The *Roman* and *Complute* Copies have 125, but I have chosen the Number of the *MS. Alex.* and *Aldine Edit.* which have 129. And this is the *Samaritan*

Samaritan, as it is also in the *Hebrew* Text; and is added in the Version of the Septuagint, and makes a Difference of 130 Years between the Chronology of the *Samaritan Hebrew* Text, and the Version of the Septuagint in the Period from the Flood to the Birth of *Abraham*.

As I have demonstrated that the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* Numbers have been greatly and wilfully corrupted in the Ages of the antediluvian Patriarchs before they begat Children; and as the same Corruptions are evident in the *Hebrew* Copy of the Ages from the Flood to *Abraham*, and several Errors also are plainly committed in the *Samaritan* Text in this Period, it will be sufficient to satisfy every learned and judicious Reader, if I can prove that *Cainan* was originally in the Text of the Septuagint, and consequently, in the *Hebrew* Text from whence their Version was made; to which other Reasons will be added to prove the Genuineness of this Generation.

That *Cainan* was originally in the *Greek* Copy of the LXXII, is proved from *Demetrius*, who lived about 220 Years before the Christian Æra, and wrote in the Reign of the (13) fourth *Ptolemy* King of *Egypt*, called *Philopator*. In his History of the *Jewish* Kings cited by *Alexander Polyhistor* in (14) *Eusebius*, he computes 1360, or rather 1362 Years [the 2 Years of *Sem* after the Flood when he begat *Arphaxad* being added] from the Flood to *Jacob's* going into *Egypt*. In which Computation it is evident he reckoned the 130 Years of *Cainan* to the Birth of *Sala*. And it stood thus: From the Flood to

Number of *Eusebius* in his Chronicon, p. 9. Though he has the *Hebrew* Number 119, in *Syncellus* p. 87. The present *Samaritan* as also the *Samaritan* Copy of *Eusebius*, have no more than 69, and so make the whole Years of *Nabor* the same with the *Hebrew* Text. The *Paschal* Chronicle, and the *Alexandrian* Annals of *Eutychius* have 129, and this, I think, is the true Number.

¹ All Copies agree in giving *Terab* 70 Years to the Birth of *Abraham*, except the *Syriac* Version, which by Mistake has 75.

^m The *Hebrew* and *Greek* Copies and *Josephus* all agree in this Number, and that *Terab* lived 205 Years; so that the *Samaritan* Number 75, which was also in the *Samaritan* Copy of *Eusebius*, is very probably wrong. But this Point will be considered distinctly elsewhere.

(13) *Ap. Clem. Alex. Strom.* I. p. 337.

(14) *Præp. Evang.* lib. ix. c. 21.

Abraham 1072 Years; thence to his Coming into the Land of *Canaan* 75 Years; and thence to *Jacob's* Going into *Egypt* 215 Years; which Numbers summed up make 1362 Years. And this Computation of *Demetrius* is greatly to be regarded, as being the most ancient that we have; and both as it contains the 130 Years of *Cainan*, and supposes the Remainder of Years from the Flood to *Abraham* to be exactly 942, as I have reckoned them, and is a great Confirmation of the other later Evidence for that Number of Years.

The Chronology of this ancient Writer taken from the Septuagint stood as follows: He reckoned 3624 Years from *Adam* or the Creation, to the Migration of *Jacob's* Family into *Egypt*; and from the Flood to the same Migration, he computed as above 1360 or 1362 Years: these 1362 Years being deducted from the first Sum of 3624 Years, leave from the Creation to the Flood 2262 Years, which I have before proved to be the original Number of the *Greek* Version, and exceeds the *Hebrew* Computation of *Josephus* no more than six Years. So that we are within six Years certain of the Period of this first *Æra* of the World, or of the Age of the old World, notwithstanding all the Confusion and Corruption of the present *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* Copies.

How *Demetrius* reckoned from the *Æra* of the *Israelites* going into *Egypt* to the building of *Solomon's* Temple, may also be fixed to the Space of 12 Years. He reckoned as all Accounts do, from the *Israelites* going into *Egypt*, to their going out thence under *Moses*, 215 Years; and if he reckoned from the Exodus to the Foundation of the Temple, as *Josephus* did, 592 Years, this was in the Year of the World 4431; to which add to the vulgar Christian *Æra* 1013 Years, which is the true Sum as will appear from Scripture, the Sums added bring the Christian *Æra* to the Year of the World 5444, and that this was the Computation of *Demetrius* is probable from the same Computation of *Eusebius*, mentioned also by *Clement Alexandrinus* with *Demetrius*, and who wrote his History of the *Jewish* Kings about 174 Years before the Christian *Æra*, from the *Greek* Version as *Demetrius*

trius had done before him. (15) *Eupolemus* computed 5149 Years from the Creation to the 5th Year of the Reign of *Demetrius* in *Asia*, and the 12th of *Ptolemy Soter* Son of *Lagus*; which last was in the Year before Christ 294, [though the 5th of *Demetrius* was in the 296th Year before Christ, and so he might write the 10th of *Ptolemy*] and this agrees very exactly with the Reckoning of *Demetrius*, and varies but a few Years from the true Scripture Chronology. For if we place the Flood in the Year of the World 2256 from the original *Hebrew* Computation, and reckon thence with *Demetrius* and *Eupolemus* to *Abraham* 1072 Years; and from his Birth to his coming into *Canaan* 75 Years, as they reckoned, and from thence to the *Israelites* coming out of *Egypt* 430 Years, as all Copies both *Hebrew* and *Greek* agree, and thence to the building of *Solomon's* Temple 579 Years [which I shall prove to be the true Number, and not 592, which is the Number of *Josephus*] and from the Foundation of the Temple 1013 Years to the vulgar Christian *Æra*, which is the Scripture Computation, and which their Computations suppose, the whole Sum will be 5425 Years, and brings the Christian *Æra* to the Year of the World 5426. And as this is the most exact and truest Computation of the Time from the Creation to the Christian *Æra* or the Birth of Christ, so it differs no more than 18 Years from the Computations of *Demetrius* and *Eupolemus*, which is a remarkably small Difference in the Compass of so

(15) The Editions of *Clement* are corrupt, which have, Ἀρχὴ τῆς πῆμνης ἔτης Δημητρίου Πτολεμαίου, τὸ δωδέκατον βασιλευσίου τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου. *Strom.* I. p. 338. The true Reading preserved in a MS. *Societ. Jes.* is, Δημητρίου βασιλείας, Πτολεμαίου τὸ δωδέκατον [ἐτῶν] βασιλευσίου τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου. And this the learned Editor might easily have seen, as I saw it long ago. See ad fin. Edit. *Oxon* p. 1027. The next Words of *Clement* are more corrupt, where he reckons from the *Exodus* to the fifth of *Demetrius* ἔτη διχίλια πεντακσία ὀγδοήκοντα. i. e. 2580 Years, which is a monstrous Parachronism. The most that *Clement* could reckon from the *Exodus* to the Time before-mentioned was 1580 Years; having a little before, p. 321, made *Moses* cotemporary with *Inachus*, (as many of the ancients erroneously did) so *Clement* wrote ἔτη χίλια, &c. i. e. 1580, which carried *Moses* to the Time of *Inachus*, first King of *Argos*, whom the Ancients, *Clement* and others, placed 1884 Years before the Christian *Æra*: and the Number 1580 added to 296 the Time of the 5th of *Demetrius* before Christ, makes 1876 Years, which was the 9th of *Inachus*. This proves both my Corrections to be right.

many.

72 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

many thousand Years. It evidently appears where six Years of this Difference lie, *viz.* between the *Hebrew* and *Septuagint* Computation from the Creation to the Flood; and the other 12 Years will easily be cleared, when we come to examine the Time from the Exodus to the Foundation of *Solomon's* Temple, in which Period they lie.

Now as the great Difficulty has always been for sixteen Hundred Years past, or more, to settle the Scripture-Chronology from the Creation to the Birth of *Abraham*, occasioned by the different Computation of the present *Hebrew* Text, and of the *Greek* Version of the *Septuagint* in this Interval, which is a Difference of no less than 1386 or of 1380 Years, as we reckon from the Creation to the Flood either 2262 or 2256 Years; the Method which I have taken to shew that the Error is in the present *Hebrew* Text only, must be satisfactory and convincing, when it is proved that the *Greek* Computation has not been altered, since the Time that the *Septuagint* Version was made from the original *Hebrew*; and farther that the present *Hebrew* Text has been altered and wilfully corrupted by the *Jews* after the Christian *Æra*.

The preceding Reckonings of *Demetrius* and *Eupolemus* which were produced with regard to restoring the 130 Years of *Cainan* to the Period from the Flood to the Birth of *Abraham* are of very great weight; and especially when it is considered, that it cannot reasonably be thought that in so few Years as passed from the Time of the *Greek* Version being made, to the Time of *Demetrius*, which did not exceed 66 Years, any material Differences were found between the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Copies, which undoubtedly agreed together (as the ancient *Jews* *Jews* universally owned) when the Translation was made. *Philo Judæus*, who wrote in the Age of the Apostles, saies of the *Greek* Version, “ that it was made with such Care and Exactness, that “ there was not the least Variation in it from the (16) sacred *Hebrew* “ Original, either by Addition, Omission, or otherwise.” — He adds:

(16) Δοκιμασθέντες ὅτι εὐθὺς ἤρχοιτο τὰ τῆς καλῆς περὶ τῆς ἐπιστοφῆς ἐπιτελεῖν. Καὶ λογισάμενοι παρ’ αὐτοῖς ὅσοι εἴη τὸ πλεονάζον διὰ τὴν ἀκριβείαν τῶν ὀνόματι καὶ τῶν ἀριθμῶν διεκρινέναι, μὴτ’ αἰετέον τι μὴτε προσθεῖναι, μὴτε μεταθεῖναι διαφανέως, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἰδέαν καὶ τὸ τύπον αὐτῶν. ἀκριβοῦς καὶ ἀσφαλὲς, &c. — εἰν τε Χαλδαῖοι καὶ ἐλληνικὴν γλῶτταν, εἰν τε

“ that

“ that the *Hebrews* (whom he calls *Chaldæans*) who understood the *Greek*
 “ Language, or the *Greeks* who had learned the *Hebrew* (which he calls
 “ the *Chaldæan*) Tongue, were so struck with Admiration at the exact
 “ Agreement between the Original and Translation, as to adore them
 “ not only as Sisters, but as one and the same both in Words and
 “ Things; styling the Translators not mere *Interpreters*, but *Hiero-*
 “ *phants* and *Prophets*, who with a Purity of Spirit had entered into
 “ the genuine Sentiments of *Moses*”

Josephus also expresses an high Opinion of the Integrity and Exact-
 ness of the *Greek* Version. He relates (17) “ that when the Trans-
 “ lation was finished, it was recited in the Presence of the Interpreters,
 “ to all the *Jews*, who were summoned by *Demetrius* to the Place
 “ where it was made; and that they approved the Work, and desired
 “ *Demetrius*, who had procured it to be done, that it might be read
 “ to their chief Men: and all of them, both the Priest and Inter-
 “ preters, and the Rulers amongst the *Jews*, requested that the Trans-
 “ lation being well done and finished, it might remain unaltered. And
 “ all approving this Motion, they gave order that if any one observed
 “ any thing in the Law (translated) that was superfluous or defective;
 “ he should make a Revise, and shew it and correct it: acting wisely
 “ in this, that what was once maturely judged to be right, should for
 “ ever remain as was.”

This shews that *Josephus* found the *Greek* Version agreed with the
Hebrew Text; and it is certain that this Translation was so universally
 approved by the ancient *Jews*, as to be authorised by the High-priest

Ἐπίπλες τῇ Χαλδαίων ἀναδιδασχθῶσι, καὶ ἀμφοτέρωθεν τῇ γραφῇ ἐνύχῳσι, τῇ τε Χαλ-
 δαϊκῇ καὶ τῇ διεκμηνυθείσῃ, καθάπερ ἀδελφὰς μᾶλλον δ' ὡς μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐν τε
 τοῖς πρᾶξιμασι καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασι τεθήπασιν καὶ προσκυῶσιν· οὐκ ἑρμηνεῖς ἐκείνης, ἀλλ' ἱε-
 ροδότηας καὶ προφῆτας προσαγορεύοντες οἷς ἐξερχέσθαι συνδραμεῖν λογισμοῖς εὐλογεῖν τῷ
 (f. τδ) Μωσέως καθαρωτάτῳ πινόμενῳ. De Vit. Mos. lib. ii. p. 658, 659, 660.
 Edit. Paris. 1640. *Philo* adds, that annually to his Time a public solemn
 Festival was celebrated by the *Jews* and many others in the Island *Pharos*,
 where the Translation was made, to renew the Memory of it, and to return
 Thanks to God for so great a Benefit. This shews the great Veneration
 which the ancient *Jews* had for the Septuagint Version, and how faithful
 an Interpretation they esteemed it to be.

(17) Antiq. Jud. lib. xii. c. 2. sect. 12. p. 595.

VOL. I.

L

and

74 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

and Sanhedrim to be read in their Synagogues as an authentic Interpretation of the *Hebrew* Original. And that the *Greek* Chronology of *Demetrius* and *Eupolemus* agreed with the *Hebrew* Chronology is attested by *Josepbus* (18), who mentions their *Jewish* History, and saies that *it did not err much from the Truth*, But *Josepbus*, or his Transcriber, mistook in calling this *Demetrius* by the Name of *Demetrius Phalereus*; for he was another and later Writer, and lived in the Reign of the fourth *Ptolemy*.

The next antient Testimony to prove that *Cainan* was in the Genealogy after the Flood is that of St. *Luke*, who has inserted his Name in his Genealogy, ch. iii. v. 36. That *Cainan* was in the original Text of St. *Luke's* Gospel cannot with any reason be doubted, when all the MSS. and Versions agree in reading it, except only the MS. of *Beza* now in the University Library of *Cambridge*: and though this MS. be as ancient as any other that we know of, it cannot be justly preferred to all the rest; and in this case more especially is to be rejected, because the whole Genealogy in which *Cainan* is left out is fictitious, and made out of a Part of St. *Matthew's* and a Part of St. *Luke's* Genealogy, and agrees to no other whatsoever. But that *Cainan* was in the Text of the Evangelist is evident from his constantly using the Septuagint Version (as all the Writers of the New Testament do) in his Citations from the Old Testament: and I have already given strong and convincing Evidence, and shall add more, that *Cainan* was in the original Text of the Septuagint. I proved from the Computations of *Demetrius* and *Eupolemus* that *Cainan* was in the *Greek* Version two Centuries and a half, or more, before St. *Luke* wrote his Gospel; so that the Evangelist could not but find his Name there. And as he must also have known whether the Septuagint Genealogy was agreeable to that of the *Hebrew*, and whether *Cainan* was in the *Hebrew* Text, and counted the *Jewish* Genealogy, he would not have inserted this Name if the *Hebrew* had it not, or if he knew it to be a corrupt Reading in the *Greek* Version. Hence we may with the highest Probability conclude that *Cainan* was both in the *Greek* and *Hebrew*

(18) ὁ μὲν τις Φαλλερῶς Δημήτριος ὁ Φίλων ὁ πρεσβύτερος καὶ Εὐπόλεμος δὲ πολὺ τῆ ἀληθείας διέμαζον. cont. App. lib. i. p. 458.

Genealogy in St. *Luke's* Age, at which Time the Septuagint was in great Reputation, and read in the *Jewish* Synagogues.

But as the Years of the Lives of the Patriarchs, before they had Children, have been, as I have proved, altered and shortened several Centuries in the *Hebrew* Text, in the Times before the Flood, we may easily suppose that in the Times after the Flood, amongst the same Corruptions one Name has been left out in the Genealogy of the Patriarchs to shorten this Period also. It is not so easy to account for this Generation being added in the *Greek* Version as for its being omitted in the *Hebrew* Text: and one may believe that the *Jews* would much sooner omit than add to the Genealogy whence their Nation descended, a Name so like the Name of the accursed *Canaan*. As it is by no means credible that the ancient *Jews*, who translated the *Hebrew* Books of *Moses*, would add this Name by meer Invention, if he had not been in the sacred Text; and as it is certain that this Name has always been in the *Jewish* *Greek* Version, we must conclude that it was originally in the *Hebrew* Text; and amongst many other Corruptions of the Scriptures has been left out by the *Jews* in their Copies since the Christian *Æra*.

Another Evidence to prove that *Cainan* was in the Genealogy after the Flood, is inferred from *Berosus*, *Eupolemus*, and *Josephus*, *Berosus* lived at the Time when the *Greek* Translation was made, and wrote his *Babylonian* or *Chaldæan* History soon after; and saies concerning *Abraham*, that he lived in (19) *the tenth Generation* after the Flood. *Eupolemus* having spoke of those who escaped the Flood, (20) saies, *that in the tenth Generation after it Abraham was born in Ur a City of Chaldæa*. Now *Abraham* could not be born in the tenth Age or Generation after the Flood, unless we reckon *Cainan*. For the first

(19) μετὰ τὸ κατὰ κλυσμὸν δεκάτῃ γενεᾷ. Apud Jos. Antiq. Jud. lib. i. c. 7. and Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ix. c. 16.

(20) δεκάτῃ ᾗ γενεᾷ φησιν ἐν πόλει — ἢν τις λέγειν πόλιν Ὀρείην — Χαλδαίων πόλιν, ἢ γενεᾷ Ἀβραμ. Ap. Euseb, Præp. Evang. lib. ix. c. 17. after the Words δεκάτῃ γενεᾷ, by a gross Error in the Copy of *Eusebius*, the Words ἐν πρισκαυ-δεκάτῃ γενεᾷ are added, which render the Passage quite Nonsense. But it is plain that *Eupolemus* meant the same as *Berosus* did, that *Abraham* was born in the tenth Generation after the Flood.

76 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

Generation after the Flood was that of *Arphaxad*, the Son of *Sem*, who was born two Years after the Flood, *Gen.* xi. 10. the second was *Cainan*, third *Sala*, fourth *Eber*, fifth *Peleg* or *Phaleg*, sixth *Reu* or *Ragu*, seventh *Serug*, eighth *Nabor*, ninth *Terah*, tenth *Abraham*.

So that if we exclude *Cainan* there are no more than nine Generations after the Flood to *Abraham* inclusive. Therefore there is no doubt but that as *Eupolemus* reckoned the Generation of *Cainan*, which I have proved his Chronology required him to do; so *Berosus*, who reckoned *Abraham* in the tenth Generation after the Flood, as *Eupolemus* did, must include *Cainan* also.

That *Sem* cannot be included in the ten postdiluvian Generations or Ages after the Flood is evident; because he was born 98 Years before the Flood; and these Years in all Reckonings to the Flood are included in the 600 Years of *Noah*. So that as the chronological Computation to the Flood ends in the 600th Year of *Noah* and 98th of *Sem*; the Computation after the Flood cannot begin with the Age or Generation of *Sem*, but must begin with the Birth of his Son *Arphaxad*, who is the first who was born two Years after the Flood; and from whom inclusive *Abraham* can only be the ninth, if we do not reckon *Cainan*. The learned *Bernard* therefore is guilty of a Mistake in alledging *Berosus*, *Eupolemus* (21) and others to prove *Cainan* not to have been in their Copies, from their reckoning *Abraham* the tenth in Descent after the Flood: *Bernard* would have it understood as if they meant that *Abraham* was the tenth from *Noah*, as *Josephus* expresses it, in which his Error lies. *Usser*, *Bochart*, and others fall into the same Mistake. But the Computation of *Eupolemus* demonstrates that he had *Cainan* in his Copy; and though *Josephus* does say that *Abraham* (22) *was the tenth from Noah*, which laid the Foundation of *Cainan* being struck out of his History; and of learned Men inferring that he was not originally in the Text of *Moses*: yet this Reason is by no means satisfactory. And the Words of *Josephus* will as much imply that *Cainan* is to be reckoned, as that he is to be excluded. For as in all Computations the Generations are inclusive,

(21) Not. in Jos. Antiq. Jud. lib. i. c. 6. p. 26.

(22) Δεκάτης ἑστίν ὁ Νῶα. Antiq. Jud. lib. i. c. 6.

Josephus could not, even according to the present *Hebrew* Genealogy wherein *Cainan* is left out, truly say that *Abraham* was the tenth in Descent from *Noah* inclusive, because in this Computation beginning with *Noah*, *Abraham* will be the eleventh, although *Cainan* be not counted. Therefore in saying that *Abraham* was the tenth from *Noah*, he meant that he was the tenth of those born after the Flood of *Noah*; and thus he explains his Sense in the next Chapter from *Berosus*, whose Testimony he alledges for the Truth of the Scripture Account. Now *Berosus* from the ancient *Chaldaean* Annals speaking of *Abraham*, as *Josephus* tells us, saies he was in the tenth Generation after the Flood; which, as I have observed, he could not be, unless *Cainan* was reckoned. *Berosus* probably never saw the Septuagint, but his Account, in which he does not expressly name *Abraham*, but intimates him under the Character of (23) *a righteous an eminent Man amongst the Chaldæans, and skilled in celestial Science*, was taken from the *Chaldaean* Records. Therefore *Josephus* in alledging the Testimony of *Berosus* that *Abraham* was the tenth after the Flood, must alledge it to confirm the Scripture Account, which he followed: otherwise he produced this Evidence against himself. So that it is, I think, very probable that *Josephus* reckoned *Cainan* in the Genealogy after the Flood, and found his Name in the *Hebrew* Text, which was not then corrupted: and that in saying *Abraham* was the tenth from *Noah*, he meant as *Berosus* and *Eupolemus* said, that he was the tenth after the Flood. The Flood being always called the Flood of *Noah*, it was the same thing to say, such an one was born so many Ages after *Noah*, as to say he was born so many Ages after the Flood. Therefore the Testimony of *Berosus*, alledged by *Josephus*, is an Evidence for the Truth of the *Greek* Chronology of Scripture, and that *Josephus* made the same Computation from his *Hebrew* Copy: and this Chronology was then universally by the *Jews*, as it was also by the primitive both *Latin* and *Greek* Churches. And it is not improbable but that they who corrupted the Numbers of *Josephus* in many other

(23) μνημονεύει τὴν τῆς πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ Βηρωσὸς, σὺν ὀνομάζων, λέγων δ' ἕτως· μετὰ τὴν κατακλυσμὸν δεκάτῃ γενεᾷ ὡς καὶ Χαλδαίοις τις ἦν δίκαιος ἀνὴρ καὶ μέγας καὶ τὰ ἔργα ἐμπειροῦ. *Jos. Antiq. Jud. lib. i. c. 7.*

Places, to make them agree with the present *Hebrew* Chronology, have corrupted him here by the Omission of *Cainan* in his History, after that his Generation had been struck out from the *Jewish* and *Samaritan Hebrew* Text.

Cainan was also in the Copy of *Africanus*, as appears from the Chronicon of *Eusebius* [p. 9.] where he both expressly names him, and also reckons from the Flood to the Birth of *Abraham* 1072 Years. But yet in reckoning the Generations afterwards, he left him out in Compliance with the *Hebrew* Text then corrupted, as we find in (24) *Syncellus*; and because *Origen* had marked him in his *Greek* Copy with an Obelisk, to denote that he was to be rejected, as *Procopius* assures us. And though *Origen* in his Hexaplar Copy of the Septuagint, remarked by an Obelisk that *Cainan* was not in the *Hebrew* Text, yet he seems to have included his 130 Years in his own (25) Computation from *Adam* to the Birth of Christ which was 4830 Years. For thus he must have computed this Sum; viz. 1656 Years from the Creation to the Flood, as it stood in the *Hebrew* Copies in his Time: from the Flood with the old *Koinē* or *Greek* Vulgate he reckoned 1072 Years (which included the Years of *Cainan*) thence to the Exodus 505 Years; thence to the Foundation of the Temple 579 Years: thence to the Birth of Christ 1013 Years: (in which three last Numbers the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Copies agreed) these Sums make 4825 Years; and he might reckon 5 Years more than I have done, in the Interval between the Exodus and the Temple: but his Sum cannot be made out without the 130 Years of *Cainan*.

Eusebius reckoned from the Septuagint 942 Years from the Flood to *Abraham* as *Syncellus* (26) observes, and was puzzled about it, and supposed that he and *Africanus* had followed a corrupted *Hebrew* Copy; not considering that he reckoned from the *Greek* Copy, as it stood corrected in *Origen's* Hexapla, where *Cainan* was marked by an Obelisk to be rejected. *Eusebius* knew and had observed from *Africanus* that the *Greek* Vulgate had the Name; but he chose to follow the corrected Hexaplar Copy.

(24) Chronograph. p. 86. also p. 54, 79.

(25) Tract. Lat. ix. in Mat. c. 24.

(26) Chron. p. 79, 80.

Moses Chorenensis not only had *Cainan* in his *Greek* Copy, but (27) says, *That all Chronologers agreed that he was the fourth from Noah.* So that the present *Armenian* Version has omitted *Cainan* from the vulgar *Latin*. *Epiphanius* (28) had him in his Copy by Name, and computed his 130 Years in reckoning 3431 Years (29) from the Creation to the Birth of *Isaac*; so that when he computed from the Flood to *Abraham* 942 Years, he followed the corrected *Hexaplar* Copy, which was published by *Eusebius* and his Friend *Pamphilus*.

From what has been said it appears very evident that the second *Cainan* was originally in the *Hebrew* Text, and the *Septuagint* Version derived from it: also that his Name continued in all the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Copies to the Christian *Æra*, and after, to the Time of *Josephus*, and the End of the first Century. But in the second Century we find that great Alterations were made in the *Hebrew* Scriptures, and that the new *Greek* Translations of *Aquila*, *Theodotion*, and *Symmachus* made from them, varied very much from the *Septuagint* Version; though, as I have proved, the *Septuagint* was always before confessed by the *Jews* to agree exactly with the *Hebrew* Original, and was publickly read in their Synagogues. In this corrected *Hebrew* Copy, the whole Chronology from the Creation to *Abraham* was altered and shortened many Centuries, and the Name of *Cainan* was left out in the Genealogy after the Flood. This last Corruption had also crept into some Copies of the *Septuagint*, one of which was used by *Theophilus* the ancient and learned Bishop of *Antioch*, who possessed that See about the Year of Christ 168. His Copy of the *Septuagint* had not *Cainan* in it, for he says, that (30) *Arphaxad* begat *Sala*: and that this was the true Reading of his Copy is confirmed from his reckoning no more 1036 Years (31) from the Flood to the Birth of *Isaac*. About sixty Years after, when *Origen* had wrote his *Hexapla*, and marked the Name of *Cainan* in his Copy of the *Septuagint*, with an Obelisk, to denote that he was

(27) Hist. Armen. lib. i. p. 12.

(28) Anchor. p. 118. adv. Hæres. lib. i. p. 5.

(29) Adv. Hæres. lib. i. p. 9.

(30) Αρφαξάδης ἐγέννησεν Σαλαῶν, &c. Ad Autolyicum lib. iii. ad fin. J. Martyr.

(31) Ibid. p. 138. Isaac Vossius's Copy of Theophilus had 1150 Years, De omitted

omitted in the *Hebrew*, and ought to be rejected, this Name began to be omitted in some of the vulgate *Greek* Copies: and both *Africanus* and *Eusebius* omitted him in their Accounts of the Generations after the Flood. And this was the Cause that *Jerome* took no Notice of *Cainan* in his Questions on *Genesis*, having found him mark'd with an Obelisk in the Hexaplar Copy, and omitted both in the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* Text; and he declared that he followed the corrected Hexaplar (32) Copy which *Eusebius* and *Pamphilus* had published.

This Compliance with the corrupted *Hebrew* Copies and new *Greek* Versions in Opposition to the faithful old Version of the LXXII, was of bad Consequence; though neither *Origen* nor *Eusebius* suspected that the *Jews* had altered their Copies. However, the more numerous and best Copies of the Septuagint, and those which were read in the Christian Churches, called the (*καιναι*) Vulgate, retained the Name of the second *Cainan*; and all the rest of the true and original Scripture-Chronology from the Creation to the Birth of *Abraham*; after which Time the Chronology of the *Hebrew* Copies and new *Greek* Versions agreed with the Septuagint.

Though it cannot certainly be known for what Reasons the *Jews* and *Samaritans* left *Cainan* out of their Copies, yet it may be conjectured that they did it, because they thought he was of the same Name with *Canaan* the accursed Son of *Ham* (though the Septuagint calls him *Cainan*) and they might think the Family of *Sem* whence they were descended, to be polluted and disgraced by a Person of that infamous Name. They shewed such a Kind of Dislike to their wicked King *Jeboiakim*, whom they hated so much, that they would not mention his Name, as the *Babylonian Talmud* tells us. But the ancient *Jews* and *Christians* acknowledged *Cainan*: and this farther appears

De Septuag. Interpret. p. 321. which if his true Reading shews he had *Cainan* in his Copy; but it appears from the *Oxford MS.* and those from which the *Benedictine* Edition 1742 was compiled, that *Theophilus* reckoned no more than 1236 Years, from the Flood to the Birth of *Isaac*, and the Sum of his Chronology necessarily supposes that he so reckoned; and therefore the Copy of the Septuagint which he used, was taken from one of those which had been corrupted by the *Jews*.

(32) Epist. ad Suniam et Fretelam, p. 627. Edit. Benedict.

with

with respect to the latter, from their reckoning (33) seventy two Nations derived from the Sons of *Noah*, at the Division of their Tongues and Separation of their Families. Now in the Version of the Septuagint there are exactly 72 Names; but the later *Jews* having left out *Cainan* and *Elisa* the Son of *Japhet*, computed no more than 70 Nations and Languages. *Hippolitus* (34) who flourished about the Year of Christ 220, must have had *Cainan* in his Copy of the Septuagint, because he reckoned 5500 Years from the Creation to the Birth of Christ.

Thus I hope I have cleared that most perplexing Difficulty of Scripture-Chronology arising from the Difference between the Septuagint and present *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* Copies, in the Period from the Creation to the Birth of *Abraham*: and particularly that which by *Scaliger* and others has been thought insuperable about the second *Cainan*; whose Generation makes in Chronology the Addition of 130 Years. And this Part of Chronology is of the greatest Importance to be cleared, both as it relates to the *Æra* of the Creation, and contains the first Ages of the World both before and after the Flood: and also because it depends in a Manner wholly on the Evidence of the *Mosaic* Writings; no other remaining History being old enough to compare with it; and affording us only Fragments of the most ancient Times, which can only be made out by probable Conjecture and by their Coincidence with the sacred History.

I shall add farther on the preceding Chronology of Scripture from the Creation to the Birth of *Abraham* the Judgment of the learned *Mori-*

(33) So *Iren.* adv. Hæres. lib. iii. c. 22. p. 219. *Clem. Alex.* Strom. lib. i. p. 338. *Recognit.* *Clem.* lib. ii. c. 42. *Eusebius*, *Epiphan.* &c. See *Bocbart.* *Geog. Sac.* lib. i. c. 15. p. 530. etc. And 'tis observable, that the ancient *Egyptians* reckoned the Nations of the World 72. *Horapol.* lib. i. c. 14. Which Tradition might be delivered to them from the ancient *Jews* or *Israelites*, when they lived in *Egypt*. The ancient *Greek* Historians *Ephorus* and others, as *Clem. Alex.* tells us [*sup.*] reckoned 75 Nations and Languages; in this Account which must have come from the *Jews*, they added the three Sons of *Noah* to their 72 Descendants. All this tends to confirm the Certainty that the second *Cainan* was one of the postdiluvian Generations.

(34) *Apud Phot. Cod.* 202. p. 526.

82 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

mus, who after considering the Differences between the *Hebrew* and the *Greek* and *Latin* Computations in this Interval, thus very judiciously concludes: “ That Number (35) [of Years] is to be ascribed to “ *Moses*, which it is certain the universal Church, in all Ages to this “ Time, without Interruption has received. But since it is, he adds, “ most evident from what has been related, that not only the universal “ Church always received the Numbers of the LXX Interpreters, but “ also that both the *Jewish* and *Greek* Historians, who wrote before “ the Time of the Apostles, and likewise in their Age, followed the “ same Numbers, it is most evident that *Moses* wrote in his Book those “ Numbers which are now in the Version of the Septuagint, and that “ the same Numbers were wrote in the *Hebrew* Copies, in the Age of “ the LXX Interpreters, and several Years after their Translation was “ made ; and that afterwards a Change was made in them, which, by “ Degrees possessed all the *Hebrew* Copies.”

This is a remarkable Opinion given by a learned and approved Popish Writer, in a Book dedicated to a Pope, against the Sincerity of both the *Hebrew* and *Latin* Bible in the Point before us ; and shews, by the Way, that the most learned and approved popish Writers never scruple to prefer the *Greek* Translation to the *Hebrew* and *Latin* Text in Points of History and Chronology, when superior Evidence appears on the Side of the former.

Morinus farther shews (36) that the *Babylonian* and *Jerusalem* Talmuds which contain the Opinions of the most ancient Rabbis, give the highest

(35) Respondeo numerum illum Mofi tribuendum, quem constat Ecclesiam Catholicam ab omni ævo ad hæc usque tempora nulla cum interruptione amplexam esse. Quum autem ex iis quæ enarrata sunt evidentissimum videatur non modo ecclesiam catholicam, LXX interpretum numeros perpetuo amplexam esse, sed etiam *Judeos Græcosque*, qui ante Apostolos aut ipsorum tempore scripserunt, eosdem numeros esse secutos. Evidentissimum sane videtur Mosen illos numeros qui nunc LXX interpretum dicuntur, in libro suo scripsisse ; eosdemque in *Hebraicis* exemplaribus LXX interpretum ætate, et aliquot post ipsorum translationem annis descriptos fuisse : tandemque mutationem contigisse, quæ paulatim codices omnes *Hebræos* occupavit, *De Hebræi Græcique textus Sinceritate*, Exercit. vii. lib. i. c. 4. p. 179.

(36) Lib. i. Exercitat. viii. c. 1. and in c. 5. he observes : Cum autem constet Christi et Apostolorum testimonia fere omnia editioni LXX interpretum Com-

Commendation to the Version of the Septuagint, and in enumerating the Differences anciently observed in the Writings of *Moses*, between the *Hebrew* Text and the Septuagint, they found that they were very few, and mention none in the Chronological Numbers from the Creation to *Abraham*. And it is certain that the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Scriptures agreed together till the Time of the Christian Æra, and at least a Century after, as is evident from the Testimonies of the ancient *Jews*, and of *Philo*, and especially of *Josephus*, who was perfectly skilled both in the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Scriptures, and had compared them together, and found an entire Agreement between (37) them. And the Apostles

conformia esse, et eorum pleraque argumenta adversus *Judæos* intentare quæ juxta neotericum *Judæorum* textum nullam plane vim habent, luce meridiana clarius est *Hebræum* et sacrum *Judæorum* textum Christi et Apostolorum tempore LXX interpretum translationi omnino similem esse, aut certe quam paucissimis ab ea diversum. Huic evidentissimæ veritati suffragantur *Philo* et *Josephus*, Apostolorum coætanei : præcipue *Josephus Hebraicæ* linguæ peritissimus, quique cum testetur e sacris *Judæorum* libris omnia sese excerpere, omnia fere LXX interpretibus conformia promit et evulgat. And presently after in *Exercitat.* ix. c. i. he adds : Sic a principio non fuisse (sc. discrimina) nullus dubito : lapsu igitur temporis in textum hæc invec̃ta sunt, nam *Judæorum* illos sapientes translationem *Hebræo* textui penitus conformem credidisse, ex iis, quæ capite præcedenti demonstrata sunt, evidens est. Hæc est *Philonis*, *Josephi*, *Talmudistarum*, et omnium *Judæorum* sententia. Conformitatem illam ad usque tempora Christi inviolatam permanuisse dubitare nemo potest. Differentiæ enim illæ, si ullæ fuissent, quæ aut momento aut numero suo considerari meruissent, *Philonem* et *Josephum* non latuissent ; *Josephum* præcipue *Græcæ* et *Hebraicæ* linguæ peritissimum. Cum vero summis laudibus translationem illam in cælum usque evexerint, de illius discrimine ab *Hebræo* textu altissime tacuerint, ἀναντιρρήτου est argumentum textum utrumque tunc sibi invicem fuisse conformem. Sed Christi et Apostolorum testimonium longe certius est. — Denique idem demonstratur ex eo quod Apostoli eandem translationem ecclesiis legendam et explicandam tradiderunt ; Apostolicique viri, quique illis successerunt, eandem commentariis illustrarunt. Natum igitur videtur tantum textuum istorum diffidium a seculo Christi ad seculum *Origenis*.

(37) *Philo* says that the *Jews* had so great a Veneration for *Moses* and the Law which he delivered to them, that in the long Space of Time which had passed to his Days, *they had not altered so much as a Word of his Writings.* Μὴ ῥ᾽ῑμὰ γε αὐτὰς μόνον ἢ ὑπ' αὐτῶ γεγεχαμμένων κινῆσαι. Apud *Euseb. Præp. Evang.* lib. viii. c. 6. p. 357. *Josephus* says the same ; Δῆλον δὲ ἐστὶ ἐργῶ πῶς ἡμεῖς τοῖς

84 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

constantly citing the Septuagint, is a still stronger Argument of its Agreement with the *Hebrew* Text in their Age; because they could as easily have cited the *Hebrew* Original against the *Jews*, in Defence of the Christian Doctrine, had there been any material Difference between that and the *Greek* Version, or if the *Jews* had had any Objection against the Septuagint, or could have alledged any Errors or Corruption in it. But the Differences between the Septuagint and *Hebrew* were grown innumerable in the Days of *Origen*, which occasioned him to distinguish these Differences by Asterisks and Obelisks. By the Asterisks it appeared what he added to the *Greek* Text from the *Hebrew*; and by the Obelisks, what was omitted in the *Hebrew*, and was added in the Septuagint. And had all after Copies carefully observed these Distinctions, we could now judge of the original Readings of the LXX with greater Certainty. But Transcribers sometimes mistook the Asterisks and Obelisks, and by Degrees (38) omitted them, so that the *Hebrew* Readings taken from the Version of *Theodotion* or *Aquila*, were mixed with the old vulgate *Greek*, and we cannot now distinguish the original Text of the Septuagint by any other Help than the Remains of the Hexapla, and the Citations of ancient Writers and Commentators, who used the old *Κοινή*, or vulgate *Greek* Version. The ancient *Vatican* Copy published at *Rome*, seems to be the freest from these Mixtures of *Hebrew* Additions, which *Origen* took chiefly from the Versions of *Theodotion* and *Aquila*; and the *Complutense* Copy is the fullest of them, as may

ιδίοις γράμμασι περιγράψαμεν. τούτῳ γὰρ αἰῶνι ἤδη παρωχηκότῳ, ὅτε προσεῖναι τις εἶεν ὅτε ἀφελεῖν αὐτῶν ὅτε μεταθεῖναι τέλλοιτο. *Cont. Apion. lib. i. Sect. 8.* Hence we may conclude that the Differences in Chronology and other Points which have since been found between the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Copies, were not known till the Beginning of the second Century, and arose from the *Hebrew* Copy being altered a few Years before the new Translation of *Aquila*; and in the Interval between *A. D.* 100, and 120.

(38) *Jerome* complains of this. Hinc apud vos et apud plerisque error exoritur, quod scriptorum negligentia, virgulis et asteriscis subtractis, distinctio universa confunditur. Again; Et dicitis quod in *Græco*, sibi, non habeat, nec in *Hebræo* habet, et apud Septuaginta obelo prænotatum est: quæ signa dum per scriptorum negligentiam a plerisque quasi superflua relinquuntur, magnus in legendo error exoritur. *Epist. ad Sunniam et Fretelam.*

easily

easily be seen by comparing it with the *Hebrew Text*. The *Alexandrian* and *Aldine* Copies are purer and more unmixed than the (39) *Complutense*. It would have been better if *Origen* had put in his Hexapla a correct Copy of the vulgate *Greek Version* without any Additions; and noted the Differences between the *Greek* and *Hebrew Text* in the Margin: this would in great Measure have prevented the mixing them as we now find they are.

But to proceed; it is proper to observe that the Agreement between the original *Greek* and ancient *Samaritan Hebrew* Numbers of the Ages of the Patriarchs before they begat Children, after the Flood to *Abraham*, greatly confirms the *Greek* Numbers and those of *Josephus*, from his *Hebrew Copy*, of the same Ages of the antediluvian Patriarchs from the Creation to the Flood; and shew plainly the Corruption of the *Masorete Hebrew* Numbers. For it cannot with any Reason or Probability be thought that they, whose Lives after the Flood were but half so long, or not half so long, as the Lives of those who lived before the Flood, should live much longer, and almost twice as long, before they begat Children, as some of those before the Flood. If they who lived but 400 and 500 Years, began not to beget Children till they were about 130 Years of Age; can it be thought that they who lived above 900 Years, began to beget Children sooner, and some of them in about half the Term of Years, as at 70 and 65 Years of Age? It is agreeable to the Course of Nature that as Men's Lives grew shorter, they should begin to beget Children sooner; and this is verified from the Scripture-History down from *Nabor*, in which all Accounts agree; and it has been so in all Ages and Generations of (40) Mankind, and is proportionably so in all Animals and living Creatures: and

(39) See *Maffi Præfat. ad lib. Joshuæ*: and *Walton's Prolegom. ix. ad Bib. Polyglot. Sect. 28, 29, 30. p. 64, 65. and Montfauc. Præliminar. in Hexap. Orig. p. 43.*

(40) It is a just Observation of *Arrian*, Οἷς τό τε γῆρας τοσῶδε ταχύτερον ἐπέρχεται, καὶ ὁ θάνατος ὁμῶς τῷ γήρει, πάντως πᾶς καὶ ἡ ἀκμὴ πρὸς λόγον τῆς τέλει ταχύτερη ἐπανθίσκει. *Rev. Indic. lib. p. 527.* That is: *It is natural that they upon whom old Age and Death come the sooner, should in Proportion to the Shortness of their Life arrive sooner to the Flower and Vigour of their Age.*

86 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

to shew more particularly the Absurdity of the *Hebrew* Numbers of the Ages after the Flood, is it at all credible that the first six Patriarchs should beget Children at about 30 Years of Age, when the others, who lived not half so long, did not beget Children till they were more than double their Age; *Nabor* at 79, *Terah* at 70, *Abraham* at 87, and after these, *Isaac* at 60, and *Jacob* at 84? What *Syncellus* has related from *Eusebius*, in Support of the Septuagint before the Flood, and of the Septuagint and *Samaritan* Computation from the Flood to *Abraham*, and which *Eusebius* copied from *Africanus*, is highly worth the learned Reader's Attention. Having given from *Africanus* and *Eusebius* their Computation of the *Æra* from the Flood to *Abraham*, taken from the Septuagint Copy, as corrected in *Origen's* Hexapla, wherein *Cainan* is noted by an Obelisk to be left out, and also of the *Jewish Hebrew*, and *Samaritan Hebrew* Copies from *Eusebius*; he adds their Reasons for preferring the Septuagint and *Samaritan* Numbers to those of the *Hebrew*.

He observes the Difference of these Computations to be 650 Years; and says, " Since according to the most ancient *Hebrew* " Copy preserved amongst the *Samaritans*, and which agrees to " the Septuagint Translation, they who lived after the Flood down " to *Abraham* begat Children not till after the Age of an hundred " Years, and so many more as these Copies give them; what Reason can be assigned, that their Predecessors (before the Flood) " whose Lives were longer by many Years, should begin to beget " Children sooner; and not rather at the Ages set down in the " Septuagint? On mature Consideration we must incline to the latter " Computation, and necessarily conclude that the *Jewish Hebrew* " Reckoning of the Times from *Adam* to *Abraham*, is wrong in " all the Ages excepting three, *Jared*, &c. and that the *Samaritan* Computation is only wrong in the Period from *Adam* to " the Flood, for in the Years from the Flood to *Abraham*, it agrees entirely with the Septuagint. But the Error of the *Jewish Hebrew* Text is evident from hence, that it makes *Abraham* " and *Noah* Contemporaries, which is inconsistent with all History. " For since, according to the *Hebrew* Text there are no more than

“ 292 Years from the Flood to *Abraham*, and since according to the
“ same Text, *Noah* lived 350 Years after the Flood, it is evident that
“ he lived to the 58th Year of *Abraham*. Wherefore it is with Rea-
“ son that in our Chronography we follow the Computation of the
“ Version of the Septuagint, which was made, as appears, from an an-
“ cient and uncorrupted *Hebrew* Copy: especially since this Version
“ alone is received by the universal Church of Christ, and was from
“ the Beginning recommended to be used by it, upon the Authority
“ of the Apostles and Disciples of our (41) Saviour.”

The *Greek* Chronology of Scripture in the Ages from the Creation to *Abraham* has been fully proved to be the true Chronology of those Ages, from the Evidence of the most ancient Copies, and the Testimony of the most ancient Writers both *Jews* and Christians; and it has been shewn that several Inconsistencies and Absurdities are consequent to the *Hebrew* Computations both before and after the Flood. I shall offer farther to what has been urged above, other Arguments and Observations which demonstrate the utter Inconsistency and Absurdity of the *Hebrew* Computation from the Flood to *Abraham*. According to this Chronology *Abraham* was born 292 Years after the Flood, and lived during the Lives of those whose Posterity peopled the Earth: and yet the Earth was every where peopled, and many Kingdoms erected and inhabited by People of different Families and Languages, when he came out of *Charran* into the Land of *Canaan*, and probably many Years before he was born. By the same Chronology *Noah*, *Sem*, and probably the other Sons of *Noah* lived many Years after the earth was peopled by their Families; and yet no notice is ever taken of them in Scripture: though, one would think, they should have had the chief Government every where, whilst they lived; if the Earth had been so full of Inhabitants, as to make it necessary for them to disperse into separate Colonies according to their Families, and erect Kingdoms in different Countries. This is therefore so plain and flagrant an Absurdity as is alone sufficient to evince the Falsity of the *Hebrew* Chronology: the Defence of which has put learned Men to the hardest shifts and most unreasonable Hypotheses to find Means of peopling

the World so soon in every Quarter, without attending at the same time to the Absurdity of making the Posterity of *Noah*, if they could possibly prove them to be numerous enough to people Countries, to be Kings and Rulers of all those Countries in the Life-time of *Noah*, *Sem*, *Ham*, *Japhet*, and their immediate Offspring, who all the while are no more mentioned or taken notice of, than if they had been dead (as undoubtedly they were) some Centuries before.

By the *Hebrew* Computation Mankind were grown so populous in the space of an hundred Years after the Flood, as by their Dispersion to people several Countries, and to erect Kingdoms in various Parts of the Earth. For soon after this Dispersion we find Kingdoms settled in *Assyria*, *Chaldæa*, *Egypt*, *Phœnicia*, and other Countries.

The learned Chronologer *Petavius* supposes the *Assyrian* Monarchy to be (42) founded 152 Years after the Flood; and the *Chaldæan* or *Babylonian* Empire must have been set up before by *Nimrod*. But where must Families be found in so short a Space of Time to people so many Parts of the Earth? yet Kings are supposed to have reigned and led abroad large armies to extend their Dominion, to have conquered and made one another Tributary, many Years before the Time of *Abraham*, who was, by the *Hebrew* Chronology, born only 292 Years after the Flood.

To account for Mankind becoming so numerous in so few Years, *Petavius* was forced to suppose, in order to support this Chronology, that Men begat Children at sixteen (43) Years of Age, and that none died for the Space of about 300 Years: which Hypothesis is not only void of all Evidence and Probability, but is confuted by that Scripture Account which he undertakes to vindicate, where none are said to beget Children after the Flood to *Abraham*, and several Generations after, till they were about double the Age which he assigns. In which time also Accidents, Diseases, and Wars must be supposed to destroy great Numbers. Other great Absurdities attend his Hypothesis; but what is before observed shews the utter Impossibility of reconciling the *Hebrew* Chronology after the Flood, either with the History of Scripture

(42) Doctrin. Tempor. lib. ix. c. 13. p. 33.

(43) Doctrin. Tempor. lib. ix. c. 14. p. 34, 35.

or that of all other ancient Nations; which in the Account of the first Kingdoms and of the Kings who reigned in them, could not have omitted the mention of *Noah* and his Sons, who lived several Centuries after the Dispersion, according to the *Hebrew* Computation; and who by Right must have had the chief patriarchal Dominion every where amongst their Posterity, in the Kingdoms erected by them, whilst they lived. Could *Nimrod*, who seems to have been the youngest Son of *Cush*, have set up a Kingdom at *Babylon*, whilst his *Father*, *Grand-father*, *Great-grand-father*, and his elder Brothers were all alive? The Silence therefore of the Names of the first Patriarchs, and the mention only of Kings who were born and lived several Generations after them, is a manifest Argument and Proof, that the Progenitors or first Patriarchs were all dead before their Posterity had dispersed and peopled Countries and erected Kingdoms in which they ruled.

Another great Absurdity in the *Hebrew* Chronology is, that *Abraham* alone, of all the Posterity of *Sem*, is said to have been admitted into Covenant with God, by Circumcision, with great and peculiar Blessings promised to him and his Posterity by vertue of it; and yet according to this Chronology holy *Sem*, the first Progenitor of *Abraham's* Family after the Flood, was living, and lived 109 Years after the Institution of Circumcision; *Arphaxad* lived 82 Years, *Sala* 107, and *Heber* 172 Years after the Covenant was renewed to *Abraham* by Circumcision. Now if all these righteous Forefathers of *Abraham* were alive, and even survived *Abraham*, can it be thought that no account would be made of them? or that they who worshiped the true God alone, as well as *Abraham*, should not be received into the Covenant with *Abraham* and his Seed? But according to the *Greek* Chronology these Patriarchs were all dead long before the Birth of *Abraham*; in whose Time their Posterity were become degenerate and had fallen into Idolatry; they also all died regularly according to the Course of Nature, the Fathers before the Sons; whereas by the *Hebrew* Computation this order is inverted and confused.

Therefore, lastly, another Reason against the *Hebrew* Chronology may be drawn from the Rise of Idolatry after the Flood. It is evident from Scripture, that *Abraham's* Country, *Chaldæa*, was overspread with Idolatry before he left it; and that his Father *Terah* was an Ido-

later (*Jos.* xxiv. 2.) so that the Worship of the celestial Bodies and of Idols or deified dead Men was probably begun in *Chaldæa*, some time before the Birth of *Abraham*. Now this, according to the *Hebrew* Computation, was in the Life-time of the righteous and religious *Noah*, the Father of the second Race of Mankind, and above 200 Years before the Death of *Sem*, the Progenitor of *Abraham's* Family, who was also also a religious Worshiper of the one true God: and therefore it is highly absurd to suppose that their Posterity should be corrupted with Idolatry, and that it should prevail whilst they were under their Care and Government, as they must have been, if they were living amongst them. And if *Noah* and *Sem* were removed from this Branch of their Family, they could not be supposed to be far from them, and must have known or heard of their Degeneracy, and have taken care to reform it by their Patriarchal Authority. But the same Idolatry prevailed in other Countries, where they must be supposed to live. And how must it have grieved the Hearts of these holy Patriarchs to see their Posterity every where to have forsaken the Worship God, who had preserved them and their Families so miraculously from the universal Destruction of the rest of Mankind, caused by their Impieties; and even to have seen them commit the same Violence which brought the Deluge upon the Earth? Could this have been the State of Mankind so soon after the Flood, and whilst it was in all their Memories; and yet we read nothing of it in the Scriptures? Or is it at all credible, or rather is it not altogether incredible? But the *Greek* Chronology is perfectly agreeable to, and consistent with the State of Mankind as represented in the Scripture, and in all other ancient History, in the Days of *Abraham*; who was, according to that Computation, born 1072 Years after the Flood; when Mankind must, in the Course of Nature, have been greatly multiplied, so as to be separated from one another according to their Families, as the History of *Moses* relates; and to have peopled several Countries.

According to this Chronology likewise *Noah* and *Sem* had been dead ~~many Centuries~~; and there was Time enough for their Descendants to degenerate from the Precepts of Piety and Godliness which they had taught, and from the example of Righteousness which they shewed whilst

whilst they were alive : and by degrees to fall into the Superstition of worshipping Angels and the Host of Heaven, and to make *Teraphims*, and Images of them : and also out of a vain Pretence of honouring and preserving the Memory of their dead Progenitors, who were the Founders of their Cities and had been famous in their Ages ; and with a Hope and Desire of having the same Veneration paid to themselves by their Posterity, to erect Statues and Temples to their Honour, and to worship them with Prayers and Sacrifices.

This Degeneracy and Idolatry made it fit for God to raise up such a righteous Man as *Abraham* to oppose it, and to preserve the Knowledge and spiritual Worship of Him, the only true God, from being lost.

I have been the longer in considering the Scripture Chronology from the Creation to the Birth of *Abraham*, on account of the great Importance of it in fixing the true *Æra* of the World ; and to clear it from the Difficulties and Perplexities brought into it by the great Difference between the Computation of the Septuagint and the present *Hebrew* Text : which Difference has for many Ages been Matter of Dispute amongst the most learned Men, and has puzzled and confounded all Chronology of the most ancient Times ; and insisting on the Verity of the present *Hebrew* Computation, has made it impossible to reconcile the History from the Flood to *Abraham* either with its own Relations, or with the Annals and History of all other ancient Kingdoms.

But since I have abundantly proved that the Variations between the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Copies were not caused by any Alterations made in the *Greek* Text, which has continued invariably the same from the Time that the Version was first made ; and since we cannot suppose that the *Jews* themselves who made the *Greek* Translation from the *Hebrew* Original, by public Authority both of the King of *Egypt* and their own High Priest, would dare or would be inclined to vary from their own sacred Books, or to give a corrupt Translation of them ; which Translation was also used by the *Jews* universally in their Synagogues, and authorised by their High Priest and Sanhedrim to be read as a faithful Interpretation of the Law of *Moses* ; and was never disused by them, till the new Version of *Aquila* was published ; so that no Alteration could be made in it without being immediately discover-

ed: since also the *Greek* Computation was the same with the *Hebrew* when *Josephus* wrote his *Antiquities* in the Year of *Christ* 94. and which he professed to have taken from a *Hebrew* Copy: and further, since the *Samaritan Hebrew* did anciently, and does still agree with the *Septuagint* in the Chronology of the Generations after the Flood, except only that *Cainan* is omitted: from all this and what has been largely before alledged, it is demonstratively evident that the *Hebrew* Copy, and not the *Septuagint*, has been purposely altered by the *Jews*, and by the *Samaritans* in part also, out of Opposition to the Gentile Christians who made use of the *Septuagint Greek* Version only. So that it is with the greatest reason that we follow the Chronology of the *Greek* Translation, which was taken from an uncorrupted *Hebrew* Copy; and which has been received by all the Churches both of the East and West; and by all the *Jews* till the second Century of the Christian *Æra*, when they set up their false Christ *Barchochab*, or *Barchochebas*, as *Justin Martyr* calls him; and is recommended and established by the Apostles of *Christ*, who constantly cite it, as will be evident to any one who carefully examines the Citations made in the New Testament from the Old; and cannot be doubted of by any judicious and learned Person.

It was not easy for the *Jews* to corrupt the *Septuagint* without being discovered by the Christians, who read it constantly in their Churches; though they certainly attempted it, and made several Alterations in their own Synagogue Copies: but it was easy to corrupt their *Hebrew* Bibles without Discovery, because few of the Christians understood the (44) *Hebrew* Language. And when the corrupted Copies of the *Hebrew* Text were authorised by the Sanhedrim, whose

(44) It is probable that upon the Destruction of *Jerusalem* and the Temple the greatest part of the Copies of the *Hebrew* Scriptures were destroyed or lost in that general Devastation: as also a great part of those Copies which remained would perish in that equal, or greater Destruction of the *Jews*, in the Reign of *Hadrian*. So that after this it was the most proper Time to introduce the Alterations then made, both in the Sense and Letters of the *Hebrew* Scriptures: and the common People not understanding the *Hebrew* Language, could not discover or judge of the Alterations made in the *Hebrew* Scriptures.

Power

Power in Spirituals was equal to a Papal Decree, these Corruptions would immediately spread every where through all the Copies of the *Hebrew* Bibles: so that it is not at all to be wondered at that the *Hebrew* Copies should be found so different from those of the Septuagint.

From these corrupt *Hebrew* Copies *Aquila* was employed to make a new *Greek* Translation in Opposition to that of the LXXII. used by the Christians; in which, as *Epiphanius* (45), who was learned in the *Hebrew* Tongue, tells us, he perverted the Readings of several Texts out of Opposition to the Version of the LXXII. and to invalidate the Prophecies concerning *Christ*. And if it be well considered, one cannot help thinking that the *Jews* had some bad Design in procuring a new *Greek* Version to be made from their *Hebrew* Copy. For had they not altered their *Hebrew* Copies, there could have been no Occasion for a new Translation; because it was confessed but about thirty-five Years before it was made, by the *Jews* themselves universally, and especially by their two most learned Writers, *Philo* and *Josephus*, that the Septuagint was an accurate and faithful Interpretation of the Law of *Moses*. But as soon as the new *Greek* Version was published, there appeared numerous Differences between that and the old Translation of the Septuagint, and particularly in the Computation from the Creation to *Abraham*, which was made many Centuries less than it had been ever esteemed before. This new Version was cried up as the only authentic Interpretation of the *Hebrew* Original; and the *Jews* henceforth laid aside the Septuagint, and pretended it was an inaccurate Translation and full of Errors, and forbade the (46) the reading of it.

(45) Ἡερμηνεύουσι τὴν [Ἀκύλας] σὺν ἑρθεῖ λογισμῷ χρησάμενοι, ἀλλ' ὅπως ἀμαρτέψῃ τινὰ τῶν ῥημάτων, ἐσκήψας τῇ τῶν LXXII. ἐρμηνείᾳ. ἵνα τὰ πρὸς Χριστὸν ἐν τῇ γεγραμμένῃ μεμαρτυρημένα ἄλλως ἐκδώσῃ. De Mensur. & Ponder. p. 171.

(46) The *Jews*, farther to shew their Detestation of the Septuagint *Greek* Version, kept a solemn Fast on the 8th Day of *Tebeth* (*December*) in order to curse the Memory of its being then made. This Scaliger injudiciously alledges to shew that the ancient *Jews* of *Judæa* never approved of the Septuagint Translation, which it is certain was made with the Consent and Approbation of their Sanhedrim; and authorized to be every where used and read in their Synagogues as an exact and faithful Interpretation of their

· *Aquila.*

Aquila of *Pontus* made his Translation of the *Hebrew Bible* into *Greek*, in the Year of *Christ* 128, and it was probably promoted by (47) *Barchochebas* or *Barchochab*, that is, *Son of the Star*, as he affected to be called, whom the *Jews* set up in Opposition to *Christ*, and proclaimed him for their *Messias*. He was the Leader of a rebellious Army of *Jews*, and commanded all *Christians*, and them only, to be cruelly tormented to death, who refused to abjure *Christ* and blaspheme his Name. It is highly probable that several Prophecies relating to the Death of *Christ*, were altered or struck out of the *Hebrew Text*, and new *Greek Version*, the better to favour the Pretences and Character of their false *Christ*. *Justin Martyr*, who wrote about the Year of *Christ* 142, his Dialogue with *Trypho* a *Jew*, gives several (48) Instances of their altering and erasing the Prophecies relating to the Sufferings and Death of *Christ* out of the Copies of the *Septuagint* used in their Synagogues. Some Years after the Version of *Aquila*, who published two Editions of it, another Translation was made by *Theodotion*, about the Year of *Christ* 185.

Afterwards another was made by *Symmachus* in the Year of Christ 200 or 201. That of *Theodotion* was more particularly designed to subvert the old vulgate Version of the LXXII. It followed it so far as was consistent with the then *Hebrew* Readings, and Alterations which had been made in the *Hebrew* Copies : and as it was wrote in a Style more like that of the Septuagint than the rest, it was chiefly used ; and in a little Time this Version of the Prophecies of *Daniel*, was received

Law. And there is no Evidence that the *Jews* ever disused or condemned it, before they had procured a new Translation to be made in Opposition to it. See *Scaliger's Animadv.* in Euseb. Chron. p. 134. and Emendat. Temp. lib. vii. p. 651. And *Philo*, as observed above (Note 16.) saies that annually to his Time a public solemn Festival was celebrated by the *Jews*, in the Island *Pbaros*, where the Translation was made, to renew the Memory of it, and to return Thanks to God for so great a Benefit. This shews the universal Approbation of the ancient *Jews* to the Septuagint *Greek* Version, down to the Age of *Philo*.

(47) See Just. Mart. Apol. I. p. 49. and Not. Edit. Thirlb. and Scalig. Animadvers. in Chron. Euseb. p. 216.

(48) Dialog. p. 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296. *Justin* saies, p. 291. Ἐτι
 πολλὰς γεγραμμέναις πλείονα πεισθῆσαι διὰ τῆς ἐξηγήσεως τῆς γεγραμμένων ὑπὸ τῆς ᾠδῆς Προ-
 ρητικῆς γεγραμμένων περιεβόησαν ἐξ ὧν Ἀγαθήνην ἔτι αὐτὴς ὁ σαυραθεὶς, ὅτι Θεὸς καὶ
 ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ὁ σαυραθεὶς καὶ ἀποδείκνυν κακὸν καὶ ἀποδείκνυν, εἰδὲν αὐτὸς εἶδεναι.

by

by the Christian Churches, as being thought better and more accurate than the vulgate *Greek* or *Septuagint*, and the latter was soon lost. It is a great Mercy that the *Septuagint* Version was not wholly laid aside; and it would be an inestimable Blessing and Benefit to the Christian Church, if it could be recovered and restored pure and uncorrupt and free from all the Mixtures of *Theodotion's* and the other new Versions made from a corrupted *Hebrew* Text.

The great and most learned *Origen* was surprized to find so much Difference as there was in his Time in the Copies of the *Septuagint*, not suspecting that the *Jews* had been tampering with them and corrupting them, ever since they had corrupted their *Hebrew* Copies, of which also he had not the least Suspicion. This made him go about to get a Copy which agreed most with the *Hebrew* and the new Versions: and with infinite Labour to compare it with them, and to note all the Differences between them with (49) *Asterisms* and *Obelisks*; that it might be seen at one View what was contained in the *Hebrew* and new Versions more or less than was in the *Septuagint*; and though he would not omit any Thing that he found in the *Septuagint*, yet he marked with a prefixed *Obelisk* whatever was omitted in the *Hebrew* Text, and was found in the *Septuagint*, (and added two Points at the End of the Sentence or Word) and placed *Asterisms* before what was wanting in the *Septuagint* and was extant in the *Hebrew*, with two Points at the End also; and supplied the Omission from *Theodotion's* Version, and sometimes from one of the others, especially from that of *Aquila*. But the Design of *Origen* in adding the *Asterisms* and *Obelisks* was not to shew, as some learned Men have thought, either what he judged was to be added to, or detracted from the *Greek* Text, but to let the *Jews* see that he represented the Scriptures used by the Christians in as full

(49) Τὴν μὲν ἔν ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγραφοῖς τῆ παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης Διαφωνίαν, Θεὸς διδόνῃ, εὐρομεν ἰάσασθαι, κριτηρίῳ χρησάμενοι τῇ λοιπαῖς ἐκδόσεσι. τῇ γὰρ ἀμφιβαλλομένῃ πρὸς τοῖς ἐβδομήκοντα Διατὶ τῇ ἀντιγραφῶν διαφωνίαν, τῇ κρίσιν ποιησάμενοι, ὅτι τῇ λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων τὸ σωτῆρον ἐκείναις ἐφυλάξαμεν, καὶ τινὰ μὲν ὠβελίσσαμεν ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ μὴ κείμενα, ὃ τολμήσαντες αὐτὰ πάντα περιελεῖν. τινὰ δὲ μετ' ἀστερίσκων προσεθήκαμεν, ἵνα δῆλον ᾖ ὅτι μὴ κείμενα πρὸς τοῖς ἐβδομήκοντα ἐκ τῇ λοιπῶν συμφώνως τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ προσεθήκαμεν. *Com. in Mat.* p. 381.

and

and perfect a Manner, as theirs were ; and also to avoid giving Offence to the Christian Church, or his Enemies an Handle against him by alledging that he had either diminished or added any Thing to the *Greek Version*. For the *Greek Text* remained entire and distinct from what was noted by the Asterisks and Obelisks. *Origen* himself intimates this in his Epistle to *Africanus* concerning the History of *Susanna* [p. 227, 228. Edit. Wetsten.] and there also gives his Friend *Africanus* to understand that the Church had no Reason to disuse the *Greek Version* ; or to apply to the *Jews* for a pure and uncorrupted Copy of the Scriptures : and farther declares his Opinion that the *Jewish* Elders and Rulers had suppressed Parts of their Scriptures, wherein their Actions were publicly condemned. *Origen* knew perfectly well that many of the Places he had marked with Asterisks were quite superfluous in the new Versions, and some of them impertinent, and were rightly omitted in the *Greek Version* of the Septuagint, and also that many of those noted with Obelisks were very significant, and either such as were originally in the *Hebrew Text*, and had been omitted by the *Jews*, or else were properly added to make the Sense of the *Hebrew Text* more easy and perspicuous, and this is evident from the Fragments of his Hexapla which remain. But there is no Doubt likewise but that he thought several Passages he had marked, were to be added to, or taken away from, the Septuagint Translation. It is farther certain that *Origen* in his Commentaries on the Scriptures, always used the Septuagint Version, though he frequently took Notice of the new *Greek Versions*, when they varied from it, as other Commentators did.

The Reasons which induced the *Jews* to corrupt the Prophecies relating to Christ are plain ; but the Reason for their making so great Alterations in the Scripture-Chronology is not so plain ; though it has been proved to be undoubted Fact.

One, and perhaps the principal, Reason may be what is affirmed by many Christian Writers ; namely, that the *Jews* altered their Chronology on Purpose to confound the Computation of the Christians from the LXX to the Æra of the coming of the *Messias*.

It

It was an ancient (50) Tradition which prevailed amongst the *Greeks* from the Time of *Orpheus*, that there would be six Generations or Ages of the World's Continuance, which they called [*γενεαὶ* or *αιῶνες*] and reckoned each the Term of a thousand Years: and (51) *Plato* cites a Prophecy of *Orpheus* founded on this Notion, that in the End of the sixth Generation or Millenary, the World would be consumed with Fire.

This Notion of the Duration of the World for no more than six thousand Years, *Orpheus* had from the *Egyptians*, and they probably had it from the *Jews*, amongst whom the Continuance of the present State of the World for six thousand Years, and after that the Destruction of it by Fire, and the Judgment and Punishment of wicked Men, is known to be a very ancient Tradition. This was built on a mystical Interpretation of the six Days Creation, and the sabbatical Day, which followed, made the seventh millenary. *Cedrenus* (52) mentions it from *Josephus* and an old *Jewish* Book called the *Small Genesis*; and the Epistle of *St. Barnabas* (53) takes Notice of it, and refers to the Words of the Psalmist, where it is said, that *a thousand Years* in God's Sight *are but as Yesterday*. Ps. xc. v. 4. And *St. Peter* alluding to the same Place of the Psalmist says, that *one Day is with the Lord as a*

(50) Per secula sex, id est, annorum sex millia manere hoc statu mundum necesse est. Dies enim magnus Dei mille annorum circulo terminatur, sicut indicat propheta, qui dicit: *Ante oculos tuos, Domine, mille anni, tanquam dies unus*. Laët. *De vit. Beat.* lib. viii. Sect. 14.

Αἰὼν ὁ τῶν χιλίων ἐτῶν ἀριθμὸς — οἱ ἐπὶ αἰῶνες ἀπὸ τῆς ἔργου καὶ γῆς κτίσεως μέχρι τῆς κοινῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀναστάσεως. Auët. *Etymolog. mag. voc.* Αἰών. See an ancient *Tuscan* Historian in *Suidas*, voc. Τυρρῶνία. and not. ad *Barnab. Epist.* § 15. p. 44. Edit. *Coteler.*

(51) Ἐκ τῆς ἐν γενεῇ καὶ ἀκαύσει κόσμου αἰδῆς [f. καὶ ἀκαύσει.] *Phileb.*

(52) Τὸν χρόνον ἡνολογήθη καὶ αὕτη ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἡγιασθῆ καὶ σάββατον ὡς καὶ ἀπασιμῶν προσηγορεύθη, καὶ ὡς τύπος τῆς ἐβδόμης χιλιετηρείας καὶ τῆς ἀμαρτωλῶν σωτηρίας ὡς Ἰωσήφ μαρτυρεῖ καὶ ἡ λεπτή γένεσις. *Histor. Compend.* p. 3.

(53) Ὅτι σωτῆρὶς [i. e. σωτῆρὶς] ὁ θεὸς κύριος ἐν ἑξακισχιλίοις ἔτεσι τὰ πάντα γὰρ ἡμέρᾳ παρ' αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη. sect. 15. See also *ibid.* p. 46, 47. and *Iren.* lib. v. c. 28, 29. and *Hippol.* apud *Phot.* p. 525. *Cyp. de Exhort. Martyr.* c. xi. *Hieron. Epist. ad Cyprianum.* Sententia Domus *Eliae*: sex mille annis durabit mundus et uno erit destructus. *Abrah. Ecchellenf. Supplement. ad Chron. Orient.* p. 160.

thousand Years, and a thousand Years as one Day. 2 Pet. iii. 8. (54)

This Notion of the six Days Creation, as implying that the World should continue in its present State for six thousand Years, and then be destroyed and changed, has no Foundation in Scripture; nor is a Day there ever understood as implying or figuratively meaning a thousand Years; neither is this implied in the Words of the Psalmist, or of St. Peter: but yet it is certain that both the ancient *Jews* and *Christians* so understood it. And as they agreed that the World was to end, and a new State of Things was to begin after six thousand Years were completed; so they also agreed that Christ was to come in the sixth Millenary of the World, which they thought was what the Scripture called *the last Days, the last Times, the future Age*, which were unanimously and rightly interpreted, of the Time of the coming of the *Messias*; and this ancient Tradition is mentioned in the Talmuds.

This Opinion gave the *Jews* an Opportunity, by altering the Chronology of their Scriptures, to alledge a plausible Reason for their not believing *Jesus* whom they had crucified, to be the true *Messias*, whose Coming they said, was to commence in the sixth or last Age or Millenary of the World; whereas it appeared from the Chronology of Scripture corrected by them, that *Jesus* came in the latter End of the fourth Age or Millenary, instead of the sixth, and so that he was not the true *Messias* who, as they pretended, was yet to come,

Abul-Pharajius (55) in his History of the Dynasties is very ex-

(54) *Theopompus* who flourished in the Year before Christ 341, related that the *Persian* Magi taught that the present State of Things would continue six thousand Years; after which *Hades*, or Death, would be destroyed, and Men would be happy, and live without Food, and their Bodies cast no Shadow [being spiritualized] It was also the Opinion of *Zoroastres*, the Head of the Magian Sect, that the Earth, after the general Dissolution, and Destruction of *Arimanius* [Satan] would be all a Plain, and make one City, wherein Men would live together in a happy State, and use one Language. Apud Plut. *De Isid. et Osir.* p. 370. This Opinion was probably derived from the *Jews* who were Captives in *Persia*.

(55) Differentiam computus LXX interpretum et *Hebræorum* ab anno mundi ad *Abrahamum* doctoribus *Judæorum* [adscribendam] nam cum pronunciatum esset in lege et prophetis de *Messia*, missum iri ipsum in *ultimis temporibus*, nec aliud esset Rabbinis antiquioribus commentum quo Christum rej-

press.

press in charging the *Jews* with contracting the Chronology of the Scripture on purpose to avoid the Evidence of Christ's coming according to their received Tradition, that the *Messias* was to come in the sixth Millenary of the World, or after the Term of five Thousand Years was past. The Purport of what he says is " That
 " the *Jews* believing it to have been foretold *in the Law and the*
 " *Prophets*; that Christ was to be sent *in the last Times*, in Order
 " for a Pretence to reject him, they altered the Epoch of the
 " World, which in Scripture is computed by the Ages of Men ;
 " and subtracted from *Adam's* Age, when he begat *Seth*, an hun-
 " dred Years, and added them to the Remainder of his Life; and
 " they did the same in the Lives of most of his Posterity to *Ab-*
 " *raham*. And thus it appeared by their Computation that Christ
 " was manifested in *the fifth Millenary* [just begun] near to the
 " middle of the Years of the World, which in all were to be se-
 " ven Thousand, according to their Tradition, and Interpretation
 " of Scripture : And therefore, said they, *We are yet in the Middle*
 " *of the Time of the World, and the appointed Time for the Appear-*
 " *ance of the Messias is not yet come*. But the Computation of the
 " Septuagint shewed that Christ came in the sixth Millenary of the
 " World, at which Time he was to come."

It is not to be wondered that the *Jews*, who before they had reject-
 ed and crucified the *Messias*, were most zealously and scrupulously exact
 and careful in preserving their Scriptures from the least Alteration by
 Diminution or Addition, being afterwards enraged and desperately mad
 against the Christians, when they found that the Christian Religion

cerent, quam si hominum ætates quibus dignosceretur mundi EPOCHÆ muta-
 rent ; subtraxerunt de vita *Adami*, donec nasceretur *Seth* centum annos, eos-
 que reliquæ ipsius vitæ addiderunt : idemque fecerunt in vitis reliquorum
Adami filiorum usque *Abrahamum* ; atque ita factum est ut indicet ipsorum
 computus manifestatum esse Christum millenario quinto [incunte] prope ac-
 cedente ad medium annorum mundi, qui omnes secundum ipsos futuri sunt,
 septies mille ; dixeruntque : *Nos adhuc in medio temporis sumus, et nondum*
adeſt tempus adventui Meſſiæ designatum. At computus septuaginta (senio-
 rum) indicat manifestatum esse Christum millenario sexto atque adhuc tem-
 pus ipsius. Hist. Dynast. Edit. a Pocock. p. 72, 73.

prevailed in all Parts of the *Roman* Empire, should not stick at any thing to perplex, and, as much as in them lay, to confound this Religion by corrupting the Chronology as well as many of the Prophecies of the Scripture, on the Evidence of which the Truth of it depended. But as *Josepbus*, their own Historian, from his *Hebrew* Copy agrees, as I have shewn, with the *Greek* Chronology before the Flood; and both he and the *Samaritan Hebrew* Copy agree with it after the Flood to *Abraham* (except only in the Omission of *Cainan* in the *Samaritan* Copy) and in these two Periods all the Differences in Chronology are contained; and as there are other Evidences also, older than *Josepbus*, to prove that the Chronology of the Septuagint was the same from the Time of that Translation being made, and has never since been altered; it cannot be doubted, but that the Differences which have since appeared, and still continue between the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Copies, were caused by the *Jews* having grossly corrupted the *Hebrew* Copies; and who have endeavoured to impose their Corruptions on the Christian Church.

There remains another no small chronological Difficulty to be considered, which arises from the Age of *Terab*, who is said (*Gen.* xi. 26.) to beget *Abraham*, *Nabor*, and *Haran*, when he was 70 Years of age: so the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan*, the Septuagint, Vulgate *Latin*, *Chaldee* Paraphrase, and *Arabic* Copies all have it: the *Syriac* Version has 75 Years. And all the Copies of *Josepbus* (*Antiq. Jud.* lib. i. c. 6.) have 70 Years, excepting one which has 130 Years. And in *Gen.* xi. 32. it is said that *Terab* died in *Haran*, being 205 Years of age; in which Number all the Copies agree, except the *Samaritan*, which gives *Terab* no more than 145 Years. Now when *Abram* his Son departed out of *Haran* to go into the Land of *Canaan*, he was no more than 75 Years old (*Gen.* xii. 4, 5.) And St. *Stephen* saies (*Acts* vii. 4.) that *Abram* went not from *Haran* till after the Death of his Father *Terab*. By this Computation *Terab* could be no more than 145 Years old when he died: yet it is expressly said in all Copies both *Hebrew* and *Greek*, the *Samaritan* only excepted, that he was 205 Years old when he died.

The *Samaritan Hebrew* Text makes, as already observed, the Number of the Years of *Terab* no more than 145, and this Number was
in

in the *Samaritan* Copy (57) of *Eusebius*, and, if admitted, solves the Difficulty which has so much puzzled both ancient and modern Chronologers. But the *Samaritan* Number seems plainly calculated to solve the Difficulty by shortening the Term of *Terah's* Life; just as the Number 130 given to him in one Copy of *Josephus* was intended to solve it another way, by lengthening his Age before he begat *Abram*. But both the Numbers are unsupported by any Evidence of ancient Copies. Yet some learned Men have supposed by mere Hypothesis, such as *Vossius*, *Usser*, *Patric*, and others, that *Terah* was 130 Years old when *Abram* was born, though all the Texts, *Hebrew*, *Samaritan*, and *Greek*, agree that he was no more than 70 Years old; which they understand of his Age only, when he began to beget Children; and they suppose that *Abram* might be the youngest of the three Sons of *Terah*, and be born sixty Years after *Haran*. But this Hypothesis is plainly too absurd to be admitted, or to have been advanced by any learned Man. It is not only contrary to the natural Sense of the Words, but tends to confound the Computation of the postdiluvian Period by adding 60 Years to it, in Contradiction to all ancient Evidence. And since it is said, that *Terah* lived 70 Years and begat *Abram*, etc. can it be understood that he lived 130 Years and begat *Abram*? It is therefore probable that *Abram* was the eldest Son of *Terah*, and was born in the 71st Year of his Age. But there is really no great Difficulty in the Text of *Moses*. For *Moses* does not say that *Terah* died in *Haran*, before *Abraham* went thence into the Land of *Canaan*; but rather intimates the contrary: for saying that *Terah's* Days were 205 Years, and that he died in *Haran*, implies that he staid and lived there 60 Years after his Son *Abram*, by God's Command, had departed out of it to go into the Land of *Canaan*: and this is confirmed by his adding in the xiith Chap. and 4th Verse, that *Abram* was 75 Years old when God called him out of *Haran*. *Terah* might be unwilling to leave the idolatrous Land of *Haran*, in *Mesopotamia*; for he seems to have been an Idolater as long as he lived. *Jos.* xxiv. 2. It appears farther from the xiith Chapter and 1st Verse, that *Terah* was alive when God called *Abram* to go out of *Haran*: for it is said, *Get thee out of thy*

(57) Apud Syncel. Chronograph. p. 88.

Country,

Country, and from thy Kindred, and from thy Father's House. These Words imply that his Father *Terab* was then alive. *Georgius Syncellus* (58) relates from some old Tradition, “ that *Terab* went out from “ *Haran* with *Abram*, to go into the Land of *Canaan*; but repenting, “ turned back, and dwelt in *Haran*, and worshiped Idols to the Day “ of his Death.” He also (59) mentions several weak Solutions of the Difficulty about the Years of *Terab*, occasioned by the Words of *St. Stephen*, *Acts* vii. 4. And to reconcile his Words with the Relation of *Moses*, he supposes that by the Death of *Terab* he meant not his natural Death, but the spiritual Death of his Soul, as being dead to God and true Religion, and devoted to the Worship of Idols.

There would have been no Difficulty or Dispute about the Sense of *Moses* and his Account of the Years of *Terab*, if *St. Stephen* had not said, *Acts* vii. 4. *Then came he (Abram) out of the Land of the Chaldeans, and dwelt in Charran: and from thence, when his Father was dead, he removed him into this Land wherein ye now dwell.* This could not be, if *Abraham* was no more than 75 Years old, and *Terab* 205 when he died; and if *Terab* was no more than 70 Years of age when *Abraham* was born, as *Moses* expressly writes. If indeed we could suppose with the *Samaritan Hebrew* Text that *Terab* lived no more than 145 Years, this would agree with what *St. Stephen* said, and no Difficulty would

(58) ἡ ἐξῆλθε Θάρ'α (ὡς Ἀβραμ) εἰς γῆν Χαναάν. ἡ μελαγχρὲς ᾤκησεν ἐν Χαρρὶν εἰς δαυλομανῶν ἕως θανάτου αὐτοῦ. *Chronograph.* p. 99.

(59) *Chronograph.* p. 94, 95. And *Augustine* thinks the Difficulty concerning the Years of *Terab* cannot be solved but by the Supposition that he lived in *Haran* after *Abraham* went thence into *Canaan*. His Words are: *Quomodo accipiendum sit, quod cum esset Thare Pater Abraham annorum 70 genuit Abraham et postea cum suis omnibus mansit in Charram et vixit annos 205 in Charram, et mortuus est; et dixit Dominus ad Abraham ut exiret de Charram, et exiit inde cum esset 75 annorum: nisi quia per recapitulationem ostenditur vivo Thare locutum esse Dominum, et Abraham vivo patre suo — exiisse de Charram cum esset 75 annorum, centesimo et quadragesimo et quinto anno vitæ patris sui: si dies vitæ patris sui anni ducenti quinque fuerint, et ideo scriptum sit, *Fuerunt anni vitæ Thare ducenti quinque in Charram*, quia ibi complevit omnes annos totius vitæ suæ? Solvitur ergo quæstio per recapitulationem, quæ indissolubilis remaneret, si post mortem Thare acciperemus locutum esse Dominum ad Abraham ut exiret de Charram. *Quæst.* xxv. lib. i. in *Genes.**

remain

remain. But that the *Samaritan* Number is wrong, and made only to solve the Difficulty, is evident from its Disagreement with the Numbers of all the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Copies and those of *Josephus*, which unanimously give to *Terah* 205 Years: and that 205 was also the Number in the ancient uncorrupted *Samaritan* Text is evident from a Passage of *Origen* (60), where he makes *Abraham* 135 Years old when he came from *Haran* into *Canaan*: but thinks that 60 Years of his Life before he was called to the Knowledge of the true God are not reckoned in Scripture. This was a *Jewish* Fable which he followed; but it shews that his *Samaritan* as well as his *Hebrew* Copy had the Number 205 of the Years of *Terah*, otherwise he needed not to have solved the Difficulty by a mere Hypothesis or Tradition which had not the least Foundation; and which also confounded the Scripture Chronology. *Jerome* (61) also observes that *Terah* lived 205 Years; and therefore no doubt the *Samaritan* Copy, which he used, had this Number: otherwise he who had solved the Difficulty about the Age of *Matbujela* from the Number of the *Samaritan Hebrew* Text, would here also have solved the Difficulty by the Number 145 of the Years of *Terah*, had he found it in that Text: and would not for a

(60) ὡσαύτε καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ Ἀβραάμ σὺν ἐλογίσθη εἰς ζωὴν τὰ ἔξ. ἔτη τὰ πρὸ τῆς θεογνωσίας αὐτοῦ. ex Sced. Combefis, ap. Montfauc. Hexap. p. 22.

(61) Erat autem Abraham septuaginta quinque annorum quando egressus est ex Charra. Indissolubilis nascitur quæstio. Si enim Thara pater Abrahæ, quum adhuc esset in regione Chaldæa, septuaginta annorum genuit Abram; et postea in Charram ducentesimo quinto ætatis sue anno mortuus est: quomodo nunc post mortem Thare Abram exiens de Charra septuaginta quinque annorum fuisse memoratur, quum a nativitate Abræ usque ad mortem patris ejus centum triginta quinque fuisse anni doceantur? Vera est igitur illa Hebræorum traditio quam supra diximus, quod egressus sit Thara cum filiis suis ex igne Chaldæorum; et quod Abram Babylonio vallatus incendio, quia illud adorare nolebat, Dei sit auxilio liberatus: et ex illo tempore ei dies vitæ et tempus reputetur ætatis, ex quo confessus est Dominum, spernens Idola Chaldæorum. Lib. Quæst. Heb. in Gen. 518. *Origen* and *Jerome* were both imposed upon by their *Hebrew* Masters in following these and others of the *Jewish* fabulous Traditions. *Philo Judæus* seems to have taken up this fabulous Tradition, and to have made *Abraham* 135 Years old when he left *Haran* and went into the Land of *Canaan*, and by this reckoning he made *Abraham* older than his Father *Terah* and Grand-father *Nehor*; agreeably to his saying that *Abraham* died the youngest of almost all his Ancestors, p. 276.

Solution

Solution have given the *Jewish* Tradition before-mentioned. It is therefore probable that St. *Stephen* followed some such Tradition, and spoke according to the then received Notion of the *Jews* that *Terab* was dead when *Abraham* went from *Haran* into the Land of *Canaan*, though he did not die till sixty Years after.

That a Tradition prevailed amongst the *Jews* in the Time of St. *Stephen*, that *Terab* was dead when *Abram* went from *Haran* into the Land of *Canaan* appears from (62) *Philo* and *Josephus* (63), who both say that *Abram* went from *Haran* after the Death of his Father *Terab*. And this Tradition was probably the Reason that the *Samaritans* in their Copy, which received many Alterations after the Days of *Josephus*, made *Terab* live no more than 145 Years, to avoid the Difficulty which hath been considered. But as *Moses* neither saies nor supposes that *Terab* was dead when *Abram* was called by God out of *Haran*, so had the learned ancient and modern Christian Writers considered that what St. *Stephen* said of *Terab's* being then dead, was only (*ex hypothesi*) from the received Tradition of the *Jews*, they would not have been entangled in such a Difficulty, as this occasioned, nor have been so much puzzled to find Solutions of it. What St. *Stephen* said was very proper to be said to the *Jews*, without determining whether the Fact which was universally believed by them, was true or not.

Concerning the Samaritan Hebrew Text and Letters, and the Time when the Hebrew Letters were changed for the present Assyrian or Chaldee Letters.

The *Samaritan Hebrew* Text has many (64) Additions, which are not either in the *Greek* or *Jewish Hebrew* Copies, and which have been anciently inserted in the *Samaritan* Copies only.

The most considerable of these Additions are part of the 6th, and the 7th and 8th Verses of the first Chapter of *Deuteronomy*, which are recited in the xth Chapter of *Numbers*, after the 10th Verse. And

(62) De Migrat. Abrah. p. 415. See the Note above.

(63) Antiq. Jud. lib. i. c. 6.

(64) See the Appendix to Mr. *Whiston's* Essay towards restoring the true Text of the Old Testament.

¶ 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, of the first Chapter of *Deuteronomy* are before recited in the xviiith Chapter of *Exodus* after the 24th Verse. This is noted by *Procopius Gazæus* above twelve hundred Years ago. And it is observable that *Moses*, in the places of the first Chapter of *Deuteronomy* before-mentioned, reminds the *Jews* that God had before spoken to them what is there repeated, ¶ 6, 7, 8. and that he himself had before spoken to them what he repeats, ¶ 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18. So that these Additions of the *Samaritan* Copy are very suitable and to the Purpose. But yet as these Additions are not in the *Greek*, or in any other Text but that of the *Samaritan* Copy, I doubt not but that the Correctors of this Copy have inserted them from *Deuteronomy* into *Exodus* and *Numbers*; and that they were originally written in *Deuteronomy* only by *Moses*, though they were before spoken to the *Jews* at *Horeb*.

In like manner the Words in *Numb.* xxxii. 33, viz. *the half Tribe of Manasses*, who are there mentioned to have their Inheritance with the Tribes of *Gad* and *Reuben*, are added five times before in this Chapter by the *Samaritan* Copy, where the other two Tribes are in the other Copies mentioned alone as petitioning for an Inheritance beyond *Jordan*. So that this Addition seems also plainly to have been inserted by the *Samaritans* as an Interpretation of the Sense of *Moses*. See other Passages in *Morinus's* third Discourse, ch. i. on the *Samaritan* Pentateuch. In which Discourse there are several Passages noted to be preserved in the *Samaritan* and *Greek* Copies, which are omitted in the *Hebrew*, and which no doubt are the original Text itself. There is a very remarkable Repetition of ¶ 20, 21, 22, 23, of the viiith Chapter of *Exodus*, where the Words contained in these Verses, and which God commanded *Moses* to tell unto *Pharaoh*, are not related by *Moses* to *Pharaoh* in the *Hebrew*, *Greek*, or any of the Copies but in the *Samaritan* only. And I think they are omitted erroneously in all the other Copies, on account of the Repetition of the Words, *To-morrow shall this Sign be*, at the End of both Narrations; the ancient Copier of the *Hebrew* carelessly passing over, and leaving out all the Words intervening between the Repetition before-mentioned. This must have been a very ancient Error which hath passed from the *Hebrew* into the *Greek* and other Copies taken from it: and the *Samaritan*.

only has preserved the original Text. It hath also preserved the entire Text of *Levit. xvii. 4.* which is defective in the *Hebrew*; but which is also preserved entire in the *Greek Copy*. The Words from the *Hebrew Copy* are, *and bringeth it not unto the Door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation*; then it follows from the *Samaritan* and *Greek Copies*, *that he may make it a Burnt-offering or Peace-offering to the Lord, for your Acceptance, for an Odour of a sweet Smell: and he that slays it without, and does not bring it to the Door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation to offer it, etc.* The Omission in the *Hebrew Copy* was owing to the Repetition of the Words, *bringeth it not to the Door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, to offer it*: the Transcriber overlooking the intermediate Words. Another Instance of like Nature is in *Numb. iv. 14.* where the *Samaritan* and *Greek Copies* are fuller than the present *Hebrew* which is defective by the Omission of the Words intervening between the Word *Staves*, at the End of two distinct Periods, *viz. And put to the Staves of it.* After which is added in the *Samaritan Text* and the *Septuagint Version*, *viz. And they shall take a Cloth of Scarlet, and they shall cover the Laver and its Base; and they shall put it for a covering of Badgers Skins, and they shall put them upon the Staves.* Another Passage wherein the Sense is left defective in the *Jewish Hebrew Text*, but is preserved entire in the *Samaritan Hebrew Text*, and in the *Greek Version* of the *Septuagint*, is *Gen. iv. 8.* where the *Hebrew* has it, *and Cain said unto Abel his Brother: and it came to pass when they were in the Field, that Cain rose up against Abel his Brother, and slew him.* The Words which *Cain* spake to his Brother are omitted in the *Hebrew Text*, by the Negligence of the Transcriber; they were, *Let us go into the Field*, which make the Sentence perfect. This is the Reading of the *Samaritan Hebrew Text*, and the Version of the *Septuagint*; and of *Clement Romanus* in the Age of the Apostles; and *Aquila* followed this Reading in his Translation (as *Origen* tells us in his *Hexapla*) though he knew it was omitted in the *Hebrew Text*. *Philo Judæus* has the same Reading; and the old *Latin Vulgate* before *Jerome*; and also *Tertullian* and *Africanus* have it; and even the *Jerusalem Targum* itself, held by the *Jews* to be of the highest Authority: so that no doubt can be made of the Genuineness of the Words. Yet *Jerome* not finding the Words in the *Jewish Hebrew*

Text

Text, though he owns them to be in the *Samaritan* and old *Latin* Vulgate, very weakly alledges, in his Questions on *Genesis*, that they were *understood, and are superfluous in the Samaritan and Vulgate*. As if it was possible to know what Words were understood, if none had been expressed. Another valuable Text which is imperfect in the *Hebrew*, is preserved entire in the *Samaritan* and *Greek* Copies, *viz. Exod. xii. 40.* which is rendered from the *Hebrew*: *Now the sojourning of the Children of Israel who dwelt in Egypt was four hundred and thirty Years.* This Reading cannot be true, because the Children of *Israel* sojourned in *Egypt* no more than 215 Years, as is evident from the History of *Moses*: and it was 215 Years more from the Time of *Abram's* coming into the Land of *Canaan* to the *Israelites* going into *Egypt*. Therefore the true Reading of the Text of *Moses* is that which the *Samaritan* has preserved, and to which the *Septuagint* agrees, *viz. Now the sojourning of the Children of Israel, and of their Fathers, which they sojourned in the Land of Canaan and in the Land of Egypt, was 430 Years* (63).

Morinus (64) observes that it is usual for the *Samaritan* Copy to insert the Passages in their proper Places, which are any where afterwards related by *Moses* to have been spoken before, though they are not there found in the *Hebrew*, *Greek*, or any other Copy. So that *two, three, five, and sometimes ten or more Verses* are found in the *Samaritan* Text, which are not extant in the *Hebrew* or any other Copy. These Additions are undoubtedly for the most Part marginal Notes which have been inserted into the Text; and it is almost impossible that so many additional Verses should be found in the *Samaritan* Copy only, if they had been originally in the *Mosaic* Text. And there is no Doubt but the Passages mentioned by *Morinus*, which are peculiar to the *Samaritan* Text, were wrote by the sacred Historian in the Places only where they are last found, although the *Jews* are there reminded that the same Words were spoken before, which they could not but well remember. However it is certain that the *Samaritan* Text

(63) See Morin. in Pentat. Samar. Exercit. iv. c. 2.

(64) In Pentat. Samar. Exercit. iv. c. 4.

has in Conjunction with the Version of the Septuagint preserved a great Number of true Readings, which have been long lost or corrupted in the present *Hebrew* Copies.

It is farther to be observed, that amongst the *Samaritan* Readings which are different from the *Hebrew* Text, some of them arose from the Similitude of the present *Hebrew* or *Chaldee* Letters, as *Beth* [ב] and *Capb* [כ] *He* or *E* [ה] and *Cbeth* or *Heth* [ח] *Mem* [מ] and *Samech* [ס] and others, which are not at all alike in the *Samaritan* Alphabet. This shews that the Correctors of the *Samaritan* Copy made use of an *Hebrew* Copy wrote in the *Chaldee*, or present *Hebrew* Letters: and so the *Samaritan* Copy, from whence the present *Samaritan* Copies are taken, must be later than the Change of the *Hebrew* into *Chaldee* Letters; which Change seems not to have been made till the second Century of Christianity, and after the Days of *Philo* and *Josephus*, neither of whom appear to have known any Thing of the present *Hebrew* Letters, or that any Change had been made in the Original, or *Samaritan Hebrew* Letters. The learned (65) *Hottinger* shews in Abundance of Places of Scripture, the Disagreement of the *Samaritan* from the *Hebrew* Text, and its Agreement in those Places with the *Greek* Translation: this *Hottinger* makes an Argument of the *Greek* Translators following a *Samaritan* Copy, which was different from the *Jewish Hebrew* Copy. But this is a mere Fiction; and it shews that the *Samaritan* Copy, whence our present Copies are derived, originally agreed with the *Greek* Version, as the *Jewish Hebrew* Copies, whence this Version was taken, undoubtedly did. The *Samaritan* Copiers also, since the Corruption of the *Hebrew* Text, may have corrected from the *Greek* Version, many Errors crept into the *Samaritan* Text. And as those great and numerous Differences chiefly arose after the first Age of Christianity, and in the second Century of it, for *Philo* and *Josephus* both say that the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Copies agreed perfectly together; this will farther prove that the *Samaritans* have been more careful to transmit their sacred Books pure and uncorrupt than the *Jews* have been. The

(65) Thesaur. Philolog. Sect. iii. Quæst. 4.

learned (66) *Morinus* thinks these Differences happened in the Interval between the Christian *Æra* and the Time of *Origen*, with whom (67) *Hottinger* in the main agrees.

The chief Alterations of the *Hebrew* Text were probably made by the Doctors of the School of *Tiberias*, and confirmed and authorized by the Sanhedrim there: and it is also probable that the old *Hebrew* or *Samaritan* Letters were changed for the *Chaldean* or *Assyrian* about the same Time, and by the same Authority.

That the *Samaritan* is the ancient or original Character of the *Jewish* Scriptures, is owned by the ancient and most learned *Jews* and Christians. The *Jerusalem* and *Babylonian* Talmuds, the *Mishna*, with many of the learned Rabbis, particularly the most learned Rabbi *Moses Maimonides*, all (68) confess this. *Origen* thought that the ancient *Hebrew* Letters were the same as the *Samaritan*; in which, he says, he was told by an *Hebrew* who was a Christian, that the Letter (69) *Thau* was made in the Form of a Cross, as it appears to be in some

(66) *Natum videtur tantum textuum illorum diffidium a seculo Christi ad seculum Origenis. De Heb. Græcique Text. sinceritate, Exercit. ix. c. 1.*

(67) *Ibid. p. 301.*

(68) See *Walt. Proleg. iii. ad Bib. Polyglot. Sect. 28 - 32. Morin. in Pentat. Samar. Exercit. ii. c. 3. Kircher's Œdip. Ægypt. Vol. i. Tom. 2. p. 81, 82.*

(69) Εβραῖοι δὲ τις ἦ εἰς Σωτήρα πεπιστευόντων ἔλαγι, τὰ ἀρχαῖα σοιχεῖα ἐμφερὲς ἔχεν τὸ Θαυ τῷ τῷ σαυρὶ χαρακτῆρι. *Schol. in Ezech. ix. 4. in Bib. Roman. ex Orig. Com. in loc. See Not. apud Montfauc. Hexap. in loc. Ezech. Tom. 2. Jerome confirms what Origen was told: he says; Antiquis Hebraeorum litteris, quibus usque hodie utuntur Samaritani, extrema Thau littera crucis habet similitudinem, quæ in Christianorum frontibus pingitur, et frequenti manus inscriptione signatur. Com. in Ezech. ix. 4. p. 754. Edit. Martian. Rabbi Azarias found the Tau or Thau wrote in the Form of a Cross, viz. ✝ in some ancient Samaritan Alphabets; and Morinus, Toinard, and others, found it so inscribed on several ancient Shekels. See Kircher's Œdip. Ægypt. Vol. i. Tom. 2. p. 94. Morin. in Pentat. Samar. Exercit. ii. p. 200, 201, &c. Huet. Origenian. lib. ii. p. 26. Walton. Prolegom. ad Bib. Polyglot. p. 37, 38. Montfauc. Palæograph. Gr. lib. i. p. 120 - 126. Chishull's Antiq. Afiat. p. 21. Not. 39. and the most ancient Etrurian † was derived from this Form of the Samaritan or Phœnician Thau, and very nearly resembled it: and by Degrees, was altered into the Greek and Latin T.*

Samaritan Inscriptions on Shekels. *Origen* (71) also says, that in the more correct *Hebrew* Copies, the Name *Jehova* was wrote in the ancient [i. e. *Samaritan*] Letters, and not in those [i. e. the *Chaldaean*] then in Use.

The Testimonies of *Origen* and *Jerome* are sufficient to shew the Sense of the ancient *Jews* that the *Phœnician* or *Samaritan* was the original *Hebrew* Letter; and the Talmuds and Misna, which were always of the highest Authority amongst the *Jews*, confirm their Testimonies: and that which puts this Matter beyond all Dispute and Doubt is, that all the ancient *Jewish* Shekels were inscribed with the *Samaritan* Characters only; as is now well known, and will be shewn presently. After the *Jews* had changed their original sacred Letters for

And *Vossius* says, that the ancient *Æthiopians* and *Egyptians* wrote this Letter in the Form of a Cross; and also that the T of the *Cartbaginians* or *Pæzi*, whose Letters were *Phœnician* and the same with the *Samaritan*, was wrote in this Form, as is seen in their Coins and Inscriptions. De Translat. LXX. Interpret. p. 94. Hence we may restore the true Writing of the Septuagint Version in *Ezech.* ix. 4, 6. where it was δὸς ✠ σημεῖον, i. e. *Tau* or *Tbau*. *Tertullian* read it signum *Tau*, both here, and in the 6th Verse, where also it ought to be ✠ σημεῖον, or signum *Tbau*, as the *Hebrew* and Vulgate *Latin* have it; and as *Aquila* and *Theodotion* read it. The LXX might write it Θαυ, as *Aquila* and *Theodotion* did, or only the *Samaritan* Letter T wrote in the Form of a Cross, viz. ✠ . And that the LXX wrote either ✠ or Θαυ is evident from the old *Latin* Vulgate, made from the Septuagint Version, and cited by *Tertullian*. Adv. Judæos, lib. and adv. Marcion. lib. iii. in which latter Place he saies the *Greek* and *Latin* T were made in the Form of a Cross; so that *Scaliger* and *Leusden* after him were really ignorant in the ancient *Samaritan* Letters and *Jewish* Shekels, when they censured *Origen* and *Jerome* for saying that the ancient *Hebrew* or *Samaritan* *Tbau* was wrote in the Form of a Cross. See *Scaliger's* Animadv. in Euseb. Chron. p. 117. *Leusden's* Philologus Hebræo-mixtus, p. 61.

(71) Καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἢ ἀντιγράφων Εβραϊκοῖς ἀρχαίοις γράμμασι γέγραπται [sc. *Jehovah*] ἔστι δὲ τοῖς αὐτοῖς. apud Montfauc. Palæog. Gr. lib. ii. p. 119. *Symeon* saies that the *Hebrews* owned that the *Samaritan* Copy was both a true and the first Copy; that is, the *Hebrew* Copy was first wrote in *Samaritan* Letters; Τὸ Σαμαρειτῶν ἀρχαιότατον ἀντίγραφον) ἢ τοῖς χαρακτέροι Δαλάττοι, ὅτι αὐτοὶ εἶναι ἢ πρῶτον Ἑβραῖοι καθουλομένην. Chronograph. p. 83, and also p. 68. And *Eusebius*, who flourished 170 Years before the Christian *Æra*, says that *Moses* wrote his Law in the *Phœnician* Letters, which the *Phœnicians* received from the *Jews*. Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ix. c. 26. p. 431. and these were the same with the *Samaritan* Letters.

the

the *Assyrian* or *Chaldaean* Character now used, to put the better Gloss on so profane an Innovation, they alledged after some Time that this Change was made by the Authority of *Ezra* or *Esdra*s, for the Benefit of the *Jewish* People, who during their Captivity had used the *Assyrian* Letters, and in a Manner had forgotten those in which their Law was written ; so that they could not read it in the old Character ; and also, they pretended, that the original Letters were left to the *Samaritans*, who were Idolaters, that the *Jews* might be separated from them, and have no Communion with them. This was believed by *Eusebius* from the Tradition of the *Jews* : *Origen* (72) was told the same Story of *Esdra*s, but it does not appear what Credit he gave to it ; but (73) *Jerome* was persuaded of the Truth of it. Yet this Account is no other than a mere *Jewish* Fiction, as will appear from irrefragable Evidence.

Aristæus or *Aristeas* (74) who wrote the History of the *Greek* Version soon after it was made, which was 285 Years before the Christian Æra, and 192 Years after *Ezra*'s Commission, in the seventh Year of the Reign of *Xerxes*, calls the Characters or Letters in which the Law

(72) Φασὶ δὲ Ἐσδράαν ἐτέροις [γράμμασι] χεῖσθαι μὲν τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν. Ap. Montfauc. Palæog. Gr. lib. ii. p. 119. et Anecd. præfix. Hexap. p. 84. And some Copies of the Chronicon of *Eusebius* ascribed this Change to *Ezra*, as *Pontacus* found : but 15 of his MSS. made no mention of it.

(73) *Samaritani* Pentateucum Mosis totidem literis scriptitant, figuris tantum et apicibus discrepantes, certumque est *Esdram* scribam legisque doctorem, post captam *Jerusalem* et instaurationem templi sub *Zorobabel*, alias literas reperisse, quibus nunc utimur : cum ad illud usque tempus iidem *Samaritanorum* et *Hebræorum* Characteres fuerint. Præfat. in lib. Reg. Tom. I. p. 318.

(74) *Eusebius* makes *Aristæus* the same with him who lived in the Court of *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, and was employed in the Version of the Septuagint. Præp. Ev. lib. viii. p. 349. *Philo* and *Josephus*, and the most ancient Christian Writers, were of the same Opinion. But if he was, as others think, a later Hellenist *Jew*, who personated *Aristæus*, and lived about the Time of *Ptolemy Philometor*, and an hundred Years later than I have placed him, his Testimony shews that there had then been no Change in the *Hebrew* Letters ; but that the Letters called *Hebrew*, and peculiar to the *Hebrew* Nation were then used.

was written, not *Chaldaean*, but *Hebrew* (75) Letters, and *Characters* which were peculiar to the *Jewish Nation*, as the *Egyptian Letters* were to that Nation.

Josephus indeed, in his Account from *Aristæus*, makes *Demetrius Phalereus* who was employed by *Ptolemy Philadelphus* to procure the Translation of the *Jewish Law*, say, that the (76) *Hebrew Character* resembled that of the *Syrians*. But this is a plain Mistake; and neither *Aristæus* nor *Eusebius* in his Citations from him have these Words. *Demetrius* there saies, (77) that the *Jews were thought to use the Syriac Language*, but he denies that they did, and saies their Language was different. And *Josephus*, though he gives a full Account of *Ezra*, never mentions the least Word of his changing the *Hebrew Letters* into the *Chaldee*, or ever appears to have known that any Change was made in them when he wrote his *Antiquities*. Nor is there any Evidence that the *Jews* pretended this Change was made by (78) *Ezra* till the

(75) Τ. γράμματα [βιβλία] Εβραϊκοῖς γράμμασι ἢ Φοινῇ λεγόμενα; again, χαρακτῆρσι ἰδίαις ἢ ἰεραῖαν χρῆσθαι, κατὰπερ Αἰγύπτῳ τῇ τῷ γραμμάτων θέσει, καθὼς ἡ οὐκ ἰδίαν ἔχουσα. Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. viii. c. 2, 3. p. 350, 351. Joſ. Antiq. Jud. lib. xii. c. 2. Sect. 3.

(76) Διὰ μὲν γὰρ αἱ τῇ ἰδιότητι τῷ Σύρων γραμματῶν ἐμμερὲς ὁ χαρακὴρ αὐτῶν. Antiq. lib. xii. c. 2. Sect. 1.

(77) Ὑπερβαίνει δὲ Σουμακὸς [Φοινῇ] χρῆσθαι πρὸς δ' ἐκ ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἕτερος πρὸς Φ. Euseb. ibid. and *Aristæus*.

(78) The learned *Schultens* observes: Veterem scripturam ab *Ezra* sine periculo novari non potuisse, saltem non sine periculo et detrimento veritatis antiquissimæ, gentem *Judaicam* tenaciorem semper fuisse rerum a patribus traditarum, quam ut priscam legis scripturam immutari siverent; et quidem in characterem *Chaldaicam* i. e. profanum non solum, sed et hostilem, ne fieri eadem potuisse ob nationis *Judaicæ* dispersionem in *Egyptum*, *Assyriam*, *Midiam*, alias regiones et oras, ut ab antiqua et omnibus hactenus vernacula lingua et norma scribendi desisteretur. Instit. ad fundament. Ling. Hebr. p. 17. These Observations are very just, though *Schultens* applies them to a different suppos. And *Harden* in his Dissertation on two Coins, inscribed with *Chaldaic Letters* at the End of the seventh Book of *Pliny's Natural History*, well observes, Cum enim *Judaicam* scripturam rectiores se esse universam patriam post annos septuaginta ex oraculo divino precepto haberent, veterem scribendi modum patriæ formæ consuetudinem confirmantissime testarentur: neque verisimile sit hanc auctoritate aliquam contempsisse, quæ vel unum aliquem privatum hominem, nedum gentem universam discedere

Age of *Origen*; which, had it been so, must have been taken Notice of by their Writers long before, and especially by *Josephus*.

But farther, that the Change of the *Hebrew* into the *Chaldee* Letters was not made by *Ezra*, nor till several Ages after, we have ocular Demonstration from all the ancient Shekels which have been found in *Phœnicia*, *Judæa*, and *Jerusalem*. These Shekels are all inscribed with *Samaritan* Letters; and the Inscription on one Side of many of them, is *The Shekel of Israel*, and on the other, *Jerusalem the Holy*. These Inscriptions prove them to be *Jewish* and not *Samaritan* Coins; for the *Samaritans* would never give *Jerusalem* the Title (79) of *Holy*: and these Shekels continued to be inscribed with the same *Samaritan* Characters to the Destruction of *Jerusalem* by the *Romans*.

Now can it be thought, that all the *Jewish* Shekels which are found stamped with *Samaritan* Characters, are as old as the Times of the Kings of *Israel* and *Judah*, or were coined before the *Babylonish* Captivity? On the contrary it does not appear that the Kings of *Israel* or *Judah* ever coined any Shekels, or stamped their Money with Figures and Inscriptions. But if we suppose they did, we may also with equal Probability admit that the *Jews*, after their Return from the *Babylonish* Captivity, coined Shekels also: and these must have been inscribed

cogeret a vetusto scribendi more — rerum novarum molitorem eum esse in-clamassent; si receptos a *Mose* et *Abrahamo* ipso characteres, quos patriarchæ et prophetæ pro sacris habuissent, et quos Deus ipsemet scriptis decalogi tabulis consecrasset, hos *Esdras* ad profanos usus dejicere, aut ad falsorum numinum cultores, quales erant *Cuthæi*, ablegare decrevisset. Veterem scripturam illi e contrario, *Judæicæ*que atque *Israelitæ*, in libris sacris præsertim, omnes summa religione tenuerunt.

(79) *Postellus* observes in Proof of the *Samaritan* being the original *Hebrew* Letters, that the ancient Shekels are all inscribed with these Letters. Ex numismatibus illis, quæ assidue in rudibus ruinæ *Jerosolymitanæ* reperiuntur, videtur illis omnibus olim fuisse idem character communis qui nunc solis *Samaritanis* in usu superest; nam præter argentea et aurea præclara numismata, quæ videre in ea lingua licuit, *Jerosolymis* vidi ærea et communia innumera, in quibus omnibus hoc est commune, quod et *Jerusalem* ipsam laudant, quæ ipsis *Samaritanis* semper post *Solomonis* tempora fuit exosa. Lib. *De Phœnicum Litteris*. He adds; that the *Jewish* Character now used does not appear on any ancient Coins.

with the modern *Hebrew* or *Affyrian* Character, if it was then made the public and sacred Character, and the old one laid aside. But if so, it is next to impossible that many Shekels, and other lesser *Jewish* Coins should not have been found inscribed with these later Characters, as well as those which are stamped with the *Samaritan* Letters, since the first are supposed to be coined so much later than the others.

But the first Mention of coining Money, is in the Letters of *Antiochus Sidetes*, Son of *Demetrius Soter*, who reigned in *Syria* during the Captivity of his Brother *Demetrius Nicator* in *Parthia*, which he sent to *Simon* the High Priest, and to the People of the *Jews*; wherein he confirms the former Immunities granted to them, and gives the High Priest Leave to coin Money for his Country with his own Stamp. 1 *Maccab.* xv. 6. This was *An. ant. Ch.* 140. And it is observable that *Demetrius* the Father of this *Antiochus* had with the Immunities which he granted to the *Jews* in the Year before Christ 152, particularly ordered that *Jerusalem* should be Holy and free. ch. x. 31. And *Jerusalem the Holy* being the Inscription of the *Jewish* Shekels makes it highly probable that they were coined and stamped after this Time; and being stamped with *Samaritan* Letters, they prove that these were the sacred and public Characters then used by the *Jews*; and that they did not then use the *Chaldaean* Letters. We may therefore with the greatest Reason conclude, that none of the stamped *Jewish* Shekels were older than the Time of *Simon* the High Priest, and the Reign of *Antiochus Sidetes*; and many of them later, nor is there any Evidence of any real *Jewish* Shekels being stamped with any other than the *Samaritan* Letters to the Time of Christianity, and even to the Time of the last Destruction of *Jerusalem* by the *Romans*, in the Ruins of which most of these Shekels were found, and all were inscribed with *Samaritan* and none with *Chaldaic* Letters, which shews that the *Jews* had then no other in public Use.

Reland (78) observes that there is no Evidence in Scripture of any Money being coined or stamped with Figures and Inscriptions either from the Time of *Moses*, or from the Building of *Solomon's* Temple.

And it is evident that in the Time of *Abraham*, *Gen.* xxiii. 16. and *David*, *1 Chron.* xxi. 25. and *Jeremiah* xxxii. 9. and *Zechariah*, after the Return of the *Jews* from the *Babylonian* Captivity, *ch.* xi. v. 12. the *Jewish* Money was paid and received by Weight. So that, as far as appears, the *Jews* coined no Money before the Time of the second Temple. And as the Kings of *Israel* and *Judah* coined no Money before the *Babylonian* Captivity; so the *Jews* could not after that, and whilst they were subject to the *Persians* and afterwards to the *Greeks*, coin Money without leave from the Princes to whom they were subject. The first Account of Leave being given to the *Jews* to coin Money and to stamp it, is, as I before observed, in the first Year of the Reign of *Antiochus Sidetes*, 139 Years before the Christian Æra; who then gave leave to *Simon* the High Priest and Governor of the *Jews*, to coin Money for his Country with his own Stamp; and declared that *Jerusalem* and the Sanctuary should be free. *1 Mac.* xv. 6, 7. This was a Confirmation of their Freedom, which they had obtained two Years before, in the Reign of *Demetrius*, *1 Maccab.* xiii. 41. but they coined no Money in *Simon's* Name till the Year before *Christ* 139, or 140, which was the first Year of Freedom mentioned in their Coins. It is said that two Years before, (81) in the Year 142. before the Christian Æra, the *People of Israel* began to write in their Instruments and Contracts, viz. the first Year of *Simon the High Priest, the Governor and Leader of the Jews.* *ch.* xiii. 42, Yet *Simon* was High Priest on the Death of his Brother *Jonathan* two Years before. And as there is no mention of coining Money till the first Year of *Antiochus Sidetes*, *anno ante Chr.* 140, I think it probable that no Money was coined before this Year. The first Money was stamped with

(81) The Yoke of the Heathen is said to have been taken away from *Israel* in the Hundred and seventieth Year, i. e. of the Kingdom of the *Greeks*, *1 Mac.* i. 10. This Æra used in the Books of the *Maccabees* was reckoned from *Seleucus Nicanor*, or *Nicator*, recovering the Kingdom of *Babylon*, and was from him called the Æra of the *Seleucidæ*. It commenced in the first Year of the 117th Olympiad, which was the 4402^d of the *Julian* Period, and the 312th Year before the vulgar Christian Æra. *Diod. Sic. Bibl. lib.* xix. p. 388. *Edit. Wesseling. Euseb. Chron.* p. 139. *Petav. Doct. Temp. tom.* ii. p. 604. *Usser. Annal. Vet. Test.* p. 442. So the 170th Year of this Æra was *Anno ante Chr.* 142.

Simon's Name, as we find it in several of the Coins, and the Year of *Freedom* was added.

The learned (82) *Caspar Waser*, in his Book of the ancient *Hebrew* Coins, mentions several Shekels and Parts of Shekels, inscribed with *Samaritan* Letters, and marked with numeral Letters, denoting the first, second, third, and fourth Year, viz. of the *Redemption of Zion*, or *Jerusalem*, or *Israel*. And *Reland*, in his fifth Dissertation on the *Samaritan* Coins, produceth some inscribed with the Name of *Simon*, or *Simeon*, and coined in the first, third, and fourth Year of *Redemption*, or *Freedom*; some of them are inscribed, *The Shekel of Israel*, on one Side; and, *Jerusalem the Holy*, on the other. As none of *Simon's* Shekels are found after the fourth Year of Freedom, this is an Argument that he coined none before the 140th or 139th Year before the Christian *Æra* (83); for he was treacherously slain by *Ptolemy* his

(82) P. 59, 77, 78, 79. See also Walton. Supplement. de Siclorum formis et Inscript. ad Bib. Polyglott. p. 36, 37, 38. Ottius apud Reland. de Nummis Samar. p. 75, 76.

(83) As the Inscription of the Years, viz. 1, 2, etc. denote the Years of the Freedom of *Jerusalem*, or of the Redemption of *Zion*, mentioned in the Coins; it seems as if the Date commenced from the Beginning of the 171st Year of the *Æra* of the *Seleucidae* mentioned 1 Mac. xiii. 51. this was in the 141st Year before the Christian *Æra*, and a Year sooner than I have supposed. See Ottius apud Reland. de Nummis Samar. p. 75, 76. And *Reland* cites *Pere Harduin* saying, Tum hæc autem arcis liberatio (de qua 1 Macc. xiii. 51.) tum libertas Hierosolymorum accepta anno superiore consignata in nummis est cum hac tergemina epigraphe, Samaritico characterè — *Libertatis Jerusalem: Redemptionis Israel: Redemptionis Zion*: anni vero quadruplicis nota, 1, 2, 3, 4. qui nummi in multis hujus civitatis cimeliis adservantur. Sunt et iidem apud Kircherum nostrum Tomo ii. Oedipi *Ægyptiaci* Part. i. p. 94, 95, 101. cum *Simeonis* nomine, non *Samuelis* ut ille credidit. Pagina quoque 102. qui prior est ut et alter eximius e Cimeilio D. Foucault diserte habent in antica parte hanc Epigraphen, *Simeon princeps Israelis*, Samaritico Characterè. De Num. Samar. p. 101, 102. But *Kircher* had these Shekels out of the Cabinet of *Franciscus Gottifred* of Rome, as he saies, Tom. II. part. i. p. 100. See *Harduin* Interpretat. Numismat. duorum ad fin. lib. vii. Hist. Nat. Plin. p. 432, 433. where he preposterously supposes the *Samaritan* Letters to have been the *Assyrian* brought into the Land of *Israel* by the *Cutbæans*.

I have seen a Shekel belonging to Dr. *Barton*, a Canon of *Christ Church* in *Oxford*, and explained by the learned Dr. *Hunt* Professor there of the *He-*
Son-in-law

Son-in-law, in the 135th Year before the Christian Æra, 1 *Mac.* xvi 16. Now as all *Simon's* Coins, and those made after his Time, are inscribed with *Samaritan Hebrew* Letters, it is evident that the *Assyrian* or *Chaldee* Letters were not then used by the *Jews*: and as there are *Jewish* Coins found stamped with *Samaritan* Characters to the Time of the Christian Æra, and even to the Destruction of *Jerusalem* by the *Romans*, it hence follows that the sacred Letters of the *Jewish* Scriptures were not altered and the Bible wrote in *Chaldee* Letters till after that Time. Nor is there any Foundation for the Notion which some learned (84) Men have received from the latter *Jewish* Rabbis, that after *Ezra's* supposed Change of the Biblical Letters from the *Samaritan* to the *Assyrian*, the *Samaritan* still con-

brew and *Arabic* Languages, viz. Dr. *Hunt* saies this Medal or Coin was struck by *Simon* (or *Simeon*) the High Priest and Prince of the *Maccabees*, on his restoring the *Jewish* Nation to their ancient State of *Freedom*.

It has on one Side a Vase, which seems to be the Pot of Manna, with the Inscription round it in the old *Samaritan* Letters: which in the *Hebrew* Letters are, viz.

שנת אחת לגאלת ישראל:

i. e.

Anno primo Liberationis Israelis.

On the other Side you have two Branches of the Palm-tree, the Emblem of *Judæa*, bending towards each other, and including an oval Space, in the midst of which is the Inscription in the old *Samaritan* Letters, viz. in *Hebrew* Letters:

שמעון כשיא ישראל

i. e.

Simeon Princeps Israelis.

It is one of the finest and most ancient of all the *Jewish* Coins that are extant. It is Brass, and almost an Ounce in Weight. There were several other Brass Coins struck by the same *Simon*, or *Simeon*, on the same Occasion, particularly one bearing the Figure of an Harp, with the *Samaritan* Inscription, which in *Hebrew* Letters is, viz.

לחרות ירושלם

Libertatis Jerusalem.

The *Palm-branch* of the first and the *Harp* of the other agree to 1 *Maccab.* xiii. 51. And (Simon) entered into it (the Tower) the three and twentieth Day of the second Month, in the hundred and seventy and one Year, with Thanksgiving and Branches of Palm-trees, and with Harps and Cymbals, etc.

(84) Hotting. de Nummis Orient. p. 145.

tinued

tinued in common Use; and therefore they alledge that the *Samaritan* Letters inscribed on Coins from the Time of *Simon* the High Priest, are not a Proof that the Scriptures were then wrote in the same Letters. But as there is no Evidence of the *Jews* using in any public Writing or Record any other than the *Samaritan* Letters inscribed on their Coins, from the Time of *Simon* to the Destruction of their City and Temple; so is there not the least Evidence or Probability that they used a different Letter in their sacred Books, from that inscribed on their coined Money: or that the *Samaritan* Letters were ever in common Use after they used the *Assyrian* in their sacred Books. And that the *Jews* had never but one Character at the same Time for public Use, and never used one Letter in writing their Scriptures, and another in their Coins, may appear from hence, that the Coins which are known to have been stamped after the *Assyrian* Letters were made use of in the Times following the Destruction of their City and Temple, are inscribed with *Assyrian* Letters, the same Letters in which their Scriptures were then wrote. This proves that the *Jews* used the same Letters both in their Coins, and in their sacred Books: and that the Pretence of their using the *Samaritan* Letters in their Coins after they had used the *Assyrian* in their Scriptures, and esteeming the latter of sacred and the former of only vulgar Use from the Time of *Ezra*, is entirely groundless and absurd. And we may be certain that all the Coins inscribed with *Assyrian* Letters and having on them the Names of *Moses*, *David*, and *Solomon*, are spurious; the *Jews* having known nothing of these Letters till many Ages after the last of these Kings. And both the learned Antiquaries who were most skilled in the *Hebrew* Coins, *Reland* and *Otty* (85) agree that the *Jews* had no coined Money before the Government of the *Hasmonean* Family, of which *Simon* was the second High Priest, and the first who coined and stamped Money: and that all their Coins inscribed with square *Hebrew* or *Chaldee* Letters are

(85) Gaudeo multa a me scripta tibi probari et eatenus inter nos convenire, quod nec hi nec ulli veterum Hebræorum nummi ante Hasmoneorum tempora sint percussi; quodque sicli isti et alii nummi literis Hebræis quadratis insigniti, qui magno numero circumferuntur, omnes pro adulteris sint habendi. *Reland. Dissert. iii. de Num. Samar. p. 95.*

spurious. So that I wonder that the learned *Caspar Waser* (86) in his Book of the ancient *Hebrew* Coins should produce a Silver Shekel inscribed in the modern or *Chaldaic Hebrew* Letters, with the Names of *David the King, and his Son Solomon the King*, as if it was an ancient Coin made in the Time of *David* and *Solomon*; and as if it was in the least probable that *David* or *Solomon* should stamp their Shekels with *Assyrian* Letters, which were not known to the *Jews* till several Ages after their Reigns: this Shekel, therefore, and all such are evidently counterfeit.

Concerning the Chronology of Josephus.

I have before largely proved that the Chronology of the *Hebrew* Copy of *Josephus* very nearly agreed with that of the Septuagint in the two Periods between the Creation and the Flood, and between the Flood and the Birth of *Abraham*. His Numbers between the Creation and the Flood have not been tampered with or corrupted, and differ only six Years from the Computation of the *Greek* Version: but in the Period from the Flood to the Birth of *Abraham* his total Sum has been evidently corrupted, so as to be made to agree to the present *Masorete Hebrew* Text, in direct Opposition to his own particular Numbers of the Genealogies of that Period: and how this Corruption was made, I have shewn above, p. 66, 67. in a Note. This Corruption has passed into several of his other Numbers, and has so much perplexed his whole Chronology, that the most learned Chronologers have not yet been able to settle the true Computations of this ancient and most valuable Historian. I shall therefore endeavour to shew where the Corruptions of his Numbers lie, and to give his true and entire Chronology of Scripture,

Josephus, according to our present Copies of his Works, reckons from the Creation to the Death of *Moses* (87) near three thousand Years.

(86) De Antiq. Num. Hebr. lib. ii. p. 71, 72. And *Kircher* follows some modern Rabbis in the same absurd Opinion. Oedip. Ægypt. Tom. II. part. i. p. 97, 98, 99.

(87) ἔτι ὁ χρόνος ἀπολείπει τετρακλίων ὀλίγον ἐτῶν. cont. Ap. lib. i. p. 441.

And thus the Place is cited in the Ecclesiastical History of (88) *Eusebius*. So that this Corruption, as I believe all other Corruptions, of the Numbers of *Josephus* was made before the Time of *Eusebius*, in order to reconcile them the better to the corrupted Numbers of the *Hebrew* Copy. But they who altered the Numbers of *Josephus* plainly designed to correct them, and sum them up in conformity only to the Alteration then made in the Scripture Chronology from the Flood to *Abraham*; the *Hebrew* Chronology from the Creation to the Flood being then not altered, but agreeing to that of the *Greek* Version. This is evident from several Computations as they now stand in *Josephus*, and all plainly respect more or less the Corruption of this Period.

Josephus reckons from the *Israelites* going out of *Egypt* to *Solomon's* beginning to build his Temple, 592 Years (89), and refers to 1 *Kings*

(88) Lib. iii. c. 10. p. 103.

(89) Antiq. Jud. lib. viii. c. 3. init. In other Places he reckons this Term 612 Years. Antiq. lib. xx. c. 10. Cont. Ap. lib. ii. and the same appears Antiq. lib. ix. c. 14. p. 506. where he reckons 947 Years from the Exodus to the Captivity of the Ten Tribes, which was *anno ante Chr.* 720. by which reckoning the Exodus was *anno ante Chr.* 1667. So that in the Number 947, it is evident that 612 Years were reckoned from the Exodus to the Foundation of the Temple; for from thence to the Captivity of the Ten Tribes was 334 Years according to *Josephus*, who always reckons the Reign of *Solomon* 80 Years: and these two Sums make 946 Years. Here if we subtract 40 Years out of the supposed 80 Years Reign of *Solomon* (to which the Scripture and all ancient Writers give no more than 40 Years) and 33 Years from the Time between the Exodus and the Building of the Temple, which will be proved to be no more than 579 Years; the Exodus will fall *anno ante Chr.* 1594, which is but one Year higher than I shall prove the Scripture to have placed it. How *Josephus* came sometimes to reckon 612 Years from the Exodus to the building of the Temple, will be shewn hereafter; but his reckoning of this Period 592 Years is confirmed from his counting it 515 Years from *Josbua's* making War upon the *Canaanites*, after the Death of *Moses*, to *David's* taking *Jerusalem*, in the 8th Year of his Reign, 2 *Sam.* v. 5—9. 1 *Chron.* xi. 1—8. to this add 40 Years of *Moses*, and 33 Years of *David's* Reign, and 3 Years of *Solomon's*, *i. e.* 76 Years, and the whole Sum is 591 Years, and so the Term is 592 Years current. This Number is again confirmed Antiq. lib. x. c. 8. where he reckons from the burning of the Temple by *Nabuchadnezzar* to the building of it, 470 Years; and from the Exodus to the burning of it 1062 Years,

vi. 1. And he has the same Number again in his *Jewish Antiquities* (B. X. ch. viii.) He also reckons from *Abraham's* going out of *Chaldaea* to the building of the Temple 1020 Years ; but he wrote 1022 Years, because he reckons from thence 430 Years to the *Israelites* going out of *Egypt* (Antiq. B. II. c. xv.) and from the Flood to the building of the Temple he computes 1440 Years, or as some Copies in *Epiphanius* have it 1400. Now as the two first Numbers, 592 and 1022, are undoubtedly the genuine Numbers of *Josephus* ; so the third Number, 1440 or 1400, is certainly spurious, and was intended to shorten the Reckoning of *Josephus* of the Period from the Flood to *Abraham*, making it no more than 418, or 378 Years from the Flood to *Abraham's* going out of *Chaldaea*, near to the corrupted *Hebrew* Chronology. Let us next see how near this corrupted Number 1440 brings the Period from the Creation to the Death of *Moses* to about 3000 Years as before-mentioned. If we deduct from it the Term from the Death of *Moses* to the Temple, that is, 552 Years, there will remain 888 Years from the Flood to the Death of *Moses* ; to which if we add 2256 Years, the Term from the Creation to the Flood, as *Josephus* computes it, the whole Period from the Creation to the Death of *Moses*, will by this Computation be 3144 Years. This Sum the Corrupter of *Josephus* called near 3000 Years, though it exceeded it near a Century and a half.

In the tenth Book of his *Jewish Antiquities*, and the 8th Chapter, he reckons from the burning of the Temple by *Nabuchadnezzar*, to the Beginning of its building 475 Years, six Months, and ten Days ; and from the *Israelites* going out of *Egypt*, to the burning of it 1062 Years, six Months, and ten Days, [reckoning as before, from the Exodus to the Temple 592 Years] and from the Flood, to the burning of it 1957 Years, six Months, and ten Days ; so the Editions have this last Number ; but all the Manuscripts *Greek* and *Latin*, and *Zonaras*, have it 1900 Years, which is the true Reading, and agrees exactly to the Computation of 1062 Years, &c. from the Exodus to the burning of the Temple ; so from the Exodus back to the Flood, by this Reckon-

thereby counting as before, from the Exodus to the Foundation of the Temple 592 Years.

ing is 838 Years; and to the Death of *Moses* from the Flood, 878 Years; and these added to 2256 as above, make 3134 Years from the Creation to the Death of *Moses*, which is ten Years less than the preceding Computation amounts to. It is added, that from the Creation of *Adam*, it was to the burning of the Temple 3513 Years, &c. But 1900 the Term from the Flood to the Destruction of the Temple added to 2256, the Term from the Creation to the Flood, make 4156 Years; and several Copies of *Josephus* here read *four thousand* instead of *three thousand*, which is so far right, though the entire Number in all the Copies is evidently wrong.

From the two foregoing Computations it appears very plain that the Numbers of *Josephus* have been corrupted only in the Period from the Flood to *Abraham*; and by this Corruption have made it no more than 3144 or 3134 Years from the Creation to the Death of *Moses*, which in a round Number, the Corrupters call about or near 3000 Years. What the true Reckoning of *Josephus* was in this Period, we shall see presently. But that the Corruption lies here, and not at all in the Period from the Creation to the Flood is manifest, because the Computations will by no Means agree to the Supposition of the Flood being placed in the Year of the World 1656. For this Number being added to the Numbers 888 or 878, the Term in the foregoing Computations supposed from the Flood to the Death of *Moses*, makes no more than 2544 or 2534 Years, which is too far short of 3000 Years, to be computed to be near it, or but a few Years short of it,

Having discovered in what Period the Corruptions of the Chronology of *Josephus* lie, I shall next, in farther Confirmation of this Discovery, shew the true Scripture-Chronology of this most valuable Historian.

In the Preface to his first Book of *Antiquities*, and in the Beginning of his first Book against *Apion*, he reckons five thousand Years (90)

(90) Μυρία δὲ ἐστὶ τὰ δηλόμενα διὰ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων, ὅτε δὴ πεντακισχίλιων ἐτῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐβίβηται. Proœm. lib. i. Antiq. p. 2. Ἦν [ἀρχαιο-λογίαν] πεντακισχίλιων ἐτῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐβίβησαν ἐκ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἱερῶν βιβλῶν διὰ τὸ Ἐβραϊκῆς φωνῆς συνεγεγραμμένῳ. lib. i. cont. Ap. init. Ἡ γὰρ μυριάδες βιβλίων εἰς ἃ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀνυμνήσαντες ἡμᾶς μαχόμεθα. δύο δὲ μίλια πρὸς τοῖς εἰκοσι βιβλία ἔχοντες ἄλλοις ἀναγεγραμμένον [sc. 5000 annos ante memoratos] τὰ δὲ δικαίως θεῖα πεπιστευμένα. Καὶ τούτων περὶ μὲν ἐστὶ τὰ Μαυραῖος, ὃ τέρας τε νόμος ἐβίβηται, καὶ τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος
from

from the Creation to the End of the *Hebrew* Canon of Scripture, which he tells us, was contained in twenty two sacred Books, and ended at the Reign of *Artaxerxes* who succeeded *Xerxes*, which began in the Year 465 before the Christian *Æra*, according to the astronomical Canon of *Ptolemy*. But he accounts the Books wrote after the Beginning of the Reign of *Artaxerxes* not to be [*ιεργὰ* or *θεῖα*] *sacred* or *divine*, or of equal Credit with the others. This repeated Number is most certainly genuine, and perfectly agrees to all the other genuine Numbers of *Josephus*, and is the Key to let us into the Knowledge of his Scripture-Chronology, which comprehended the Space, as he tells us, of five thousand Years. Therefore when the present Copies make him reckon from the Creation to the Death of *Moses*, something less than three thousand Years; this is an evident Corruption of his Text, as I have proved, and no Way agrees to his reckoning five thousand Years to the Reign of *Artaxerxes*. For from the Death of *Moses*, *Josephus* reckons 1022 Years to the burning of the Temple by *Nabuchadnezzar*, which was 122 Years before the Reign of *Artaxerxes*: and these Sums added to 3000, make no more than 4144 instead of 5000 Years. So that *Josephus* undoubtedly wrote that it was something less than 3900 Years from the Creation to the Death of *Moses*, it being not quite 3900 Years, but only 3873 Years, which, as he says, is a few Years less than 3900 Years. The Corrupter, finding this Number not to

ἡ ἀπόδοσις μέχρι τῆς αὐτῆς τελευτῆς, ἔτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ χρόνος ἀπλείπει τετρακλίων ὀλίγον ἐτῶν. ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Μωϋσέως τελευτῆς μέχρι τῆς Αρταξέρξεως καὶ ΜῆΞέρξην Περσῶν βασιλείας ἀρχῆς, οἱ μὲν Μωϋσῆν προφητὰς τὰ κατ' αὐτὰς περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας — ἀπὸ δὲ Αρταξέρξεως μέχρι καὶ ἡμᾶς χρόνος γεγραπταί μὲν ἑκάστα, πίστεως δὲ ἔχ' ὁμοίας ἡξιώται τοῖς περὶ αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ πὸ μὴ γενέσθαι τῶν προφητῶν ἀκριβῆς ἀξιοδοχήν. *ibid.* Sect. 8. Now in this last Computation of near 3000 Years Years from the Creation to the Death of *Moses*, it is certain that *Josephus* wrote 3900 Years; for it was 3873 Years, which is proved to be the real Reckoning of *Josephus* inferred from his making it 5000 Years from the Creation to the Reign of *Artaxerxes*. It is therefore probable that it was wrote in numeral Letters Γ. ς. 3900, and the Corrupter left out the Letter ς i. e. 900. *Eusebius* in his *Chron.* p. 132. agrees with *Josephus* that the Canon of the *Jewish* sacred Scriptures ended with the Writings of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, whom *Josephus* placed in the Reign of *Xerxes*. Huc usque divinæ scripturæ *Hebræorum* annales temporum continent.

agree to the then received *Hebrew* Chronology, left out the numeral Letter which signified 900 as observed in the Note above.

Now if we add to 3873, the other unquestionable Number of *Josephus* 1022 Years, the Term from the Death of *Moses* to the burning of the Temple; and also 122 Years, the Term from the burning of the Temple to the Reign of *Artaxerxes*, according to *Ptolemy's* Canon and the true Scripture Computation, the whole Term from the Creation to the Reign of *Artaxerxes* will be 5017 Years; and this exceeding the above Sum of *Josephus* only 17 Years, he might very well call it in a round Number 5000 Years. Thus at last we are able with some Difficulty, and amidst great Confusion and Perplexity caused by the Corruption of many of the Numbers of *Josephus* after the Flood, in order to make them agree with the corrupted *Hebrew* Text, to determine his real Chronology of the *Hebrew* Scriptures, and which demonstratively agrees with the *Greek* Chronology of Scripture, both before and after the Flood, within a few Years, the Reason of which small Difference will easily be accounted for.

The settling the Chronology of *Josephus*, which the most learned Chronologers have hitherto in vain attempted, is of the greatest Importance towards ascertaining the true Scripture Æra from the Creation to the Birth of Christ; because *Josephus* took his Accounts from the *Hebrew* Text, before it had undergone any Alterations and Corruptions from the *Jews*: and as it appears evident that these Accounts agree with the *Greek* Chronology, in Opposition to the present *Masorete Hebrew* Computation, we are hence certain that the Septuagint has preserved and given us the Chronology of the genuine and original *Hebrew* Text.

From the foregoing Observations it appears that the Chronology of *Josephus* stood as follows: from the Creation to the Flood he reckoned 2256 Years. From the Flood to the Birth of *Abraham* (*Cainan* included) 1072 Years; thence to his going out of *Chaldæa* into the Land of *Canaan* 75 Years; thence to the *Israelites* going out of *Egypt* 430 Years; thence to the building of the Temple 592 Years; thence to the burning of it by *Nabuchadnezzar*, 470 Years; thence to the Reign of *Artaxerxes* by *Ptolemy's* Canon 122 Years; in all 5017 Years.

From

From this Computation it is evident, that to make up the Sum of 5000 (or more strictly 5017) Years from the Creation to the Reign of *Artaxerxes*, which is the Sum of the *Hebrew* Scripture-Chronology, as *Josephus* computes it in two Places, he must include the 130 Years of *Cainan* to the Birth of *Salab*; and therefore the Genealogy of *Cainan* which is still in the Septuagint *Greek* Version, and in *St. Luke's* Gospel, and was extant from the Time of making the *Greek* Version, was originally in the *Hebrew* Text of *Moses*, and in the *Hebrew* Copy of *Josephus*. And farther, as *Josephus* reckons 5000, or rather exactly 5017 Years from the Creation to the Reign of *Artaxerxes*, so reckoning with *Ptolemy's* Canon 464 Years; from thence to the vulgar *Æra* of *Christ*, the whole Sum from the Creation to the Christian *Æra*, is 5481 Years; and the true Scripture-Chronology in this Period is 5425 Years. The Difference is only 56 Years; and of these 53 Years are accounted for by *Josephus* reckoning the Reign of *Solomon* to be 80 Years, (91) whereas the *Greek* and present *Hebrew* Texts make it no more than 40 Years; to which Number (92) *Eupolemus* and all the Ancients, *Greek* and *Latin* Writers, agree, and so this latter must be reckoned the true Number; and also by his computing 592 Years from the Exodus to the Foundation of *Solomon's* Temple, which ought to be reckoned no more than 579 Years, according to both the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Computations of the Years of the *Judges* on whose Times this Period depends, as I shall fully prove. The Error of *Josephus* in these two Numbers is 53 Years, and these deducted, leave his total Sum from the Creation to the Christian *Æra* 5428 Years, which is three Years more than I compute this Period. For from the Creation to the Flood I have computed with *Josephus* 2256 Years, and have shewn this to be most probably the true Number, though it is six Years less than the Septuagint Computation. From the Flood to the Birth of *Abraham* I have proved to be 1072 Years, and also that *Josephus* must have had the same Number in his Computation. From the Birth of *Abraham* to the *Israelites* going out of *Egypt* is by all Accounts 505 Years.

(91) *Antiq. Jud.* lib. viii. c. 7. fin. p. 443.

(92) *Ap. Euseb. Præp. Evang.* lib. ix. c. 34. fin.

These three Numbers are already proved and fixed. The Number 579 the Term of Years between the Exodus and the building of the Temple, and the Number 1013 the Term of Years from thence to the vulgar Christian Æra, will be fully proved in the Process of this Work : these Numbers make together 5425 Years, which is the true Epoch of Time from the Creation to the Birth of *Christ*, or the vulgar Christian Æra.

As a Conclusion to the Observations on the Chronology of *Josephus* I will add one plain and, as I think, demonstrative Argument, that he could not compute the Years from the Flood to *Abraham*, according to the present *Hebrew* Chronology in that Interval. He says (93) that *Abraham* was the first who had Courage to attempt a Change and Reformation in the received Opinion of the Deity ; and to publish the Doctrine of one God the Creator of all Things. But this was not true according to the present *Hebrew* Chronology. For according to this *Noah* himself, the great Preacher of Righteousness, and of the Knowledge of the true God, died but seventeen Years before *Abraham* was called ; and so preached the Doctrine of the Unity of God, during a great Part of the Life of *Abraham* : and *Sem* the great Progenitor of *Abraham* preached the same Doctrine all the Life-time of *Abraham*, and even several Years after his Death. And without Doubt the Doctrine and Worship of the one true God was the received Religion which prevailed during the Lives of these two most eminent Patriarchs ; and very probably continued in *Chaldæa* during the Life-time of *Arphaxad*, *Cainan*, *Sala*, and *Heber*. But supposing *Josephus* to agree with the *Greek* Chronology of Scripture, what he says concerning *Abraham* is highly credible, namely that he was the first who attempted to reform the Doctrine and Worship of God after they had been corrupted with Idolatry. For *Noah* died 797 Years, and *Sem* 645 Years ;

(93) Τὴν περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ δόξαν ἥ ἅπασα σωθήσεται εἶναι, καλῶσαι καὶ μεταβαλεῖν ἔγνω, πρῶτον ἔν τε λαμῶ Θεὸν ἀποφύνασθαι ὁμιλεῖν τε ὅλων ἐνα. Antiq. Jud. lib. i. c. 7. sect. 1. Πιστεύσαι λέγει τῷ Θεῷ πρῶτον. ἔπειτα καὶ πρῶτον ἀκλινῇ καὶ βεβαίαν ἔχεν ὑπόληψιν, ὥς ἐστιν ἐν αἰτίαις τὸ ἀνωτάτω καὶ προνοεῖ τῶ τε κόσμῳ καὶ τῷ ὡ αὐτῷ. Phil. de Nobilitate, p. 908.

Ar-

Arphaxad 607 Years; *Cainan* 550 Years; *Sala* 447 Years; and *Heber* 346 Years before the Call of *Abraham*: in which last Interval Mankind was become degenerate and corrupted with Idolatry, which had generally prevailed in all Countries where they were dispersed; and *Abraham* might well be the *first* in the Age wherein he lived, who opposed the Superstition which prevailed in his own Family amongst his Progenitors, as well as in the Country where he dwelt, and maintained the Worship of *the one true God*. Hence therefore it is evident that *Josephus* did not follow the present *Hebrew* Chronology in the Times from the Flood to *Abraham*, any more than he did in the *Æra* from the Creation to the Flood; but agreed in both these Periods entirely with the Chronology of the Septuagint.

The Genealogy of the Patriarchs from Abraham to Moses.

It has been proved above, that *Abraham* was born 1072 Years after the Flood; this was in the Year of the World 3329, and 2097 Years before the Christian *Æra*. *Isaac* was born when *Abraham* was an hundred Years old (*Gen.* xvii. 17.) and so in the Year before *Christ* 1998. *Isaac* was sixty Years of Age when *Jacob* was born (*Gen.* xxv. 26.) in the Year before *Christ* 1938. *Jacob* was 77 Years of Age, when he went to *Haran* to his Uncle *Laban*, *Gen.* xxviii. For it appears from ch. xxx. v. 25, 26. that *Jacob* had served *Laban* 14 Years for his two Daughters, when *Rachel* had born *Joseph*; and that he was then 91 Years of Age appears from his and *Joseph's* Age. For *Joseph* was 30 Years old when he was advanced in *Pharaoh's* Court (*Gen.* xli. 41.) and nine Years after in the Beginning of the third Year of Famine, *Jacob* went with his Family into *Egypt*, and was then 130 Years old, as he told *Pharaoh* (ch. xlvii. v. 9.) By this Account it is evident that *Jacob* was 91 if not 92 Years old, when *Joseph* was born after the 14 Years Servitude under his Uncle *Laban*, and 77 Years old when he went to *Haran*.

Demetrius (94) also in his *Jewish History* saies, that *Jacob* was 77

(94) Ap. Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ix. c. 21.

Years

Years old, and *Isaac* 137; being sixty when *Jacob* was born; and (95) *Africanus* and *Eusebius* (96) say the same.

Jacob having served his Uncle *Laban* seven Years for *Rachel* had *Leab* put upon him; but after a Week's Cohabitation with her, *Laban* gave him *Rachel* also. That *Jacob* served seven Years before he married *Leab* and *Rachel*, is evident from *Gen.* xxix. 20,—27. It is said *¶* 20. *Jacob served seven Years for Rachel* — and *¶* 21. *Jacob said unto Laban, give me my Wife (for my Days are fulfilled) that I may go in unto her.* This plainly shews that he had not his Wife, nor did cohabit with her till the Time of his Service was ended. And after *Leab* had been put upon him for *Rachel*, he had *Rachel* given him also on Condition of his *serving* *Laban yet seven other Years*, *¶* 27. So that nothing can be plainer than that *Jacob* served *Laban* seven Years before he had either of his Daughters to Wife, and then he had them both on Condition of another seven Years Service. This is the evident and natural Sense of the Words of Scripture; and *Demetrius* (97) so understands them, and also (98) *Josephus* and *Eusebius* (99). So that Archbishop *Usher*, (1) and other Chronologers who follow him, are guilty of a gross Mistake in supposing *Jacob* to have married *Leab* and *Rachel*, and to have cohabited with them as soon as he had hired himself to *Laban*. *Reuben* was born (*Gen.* xxix. 32.) in the 86th Year of *Jacob's* Age, and in the Year before *Christ* 1853, he lived 124 Years according to the (2) *Testament* ascribed to him.

(95) Ap. Syncel. Chronograph. p. 105.

(96) In Chron.

(97) Ap. Euseb. sup.

(98) Antiq. Jud. lib. i. c. 19.

(99) In Chron.

(1) Annal. vet. Test. p. 12, 13.

(2) Ap. Grab. Spicileg. sect. i. p. 145. Tom. I. The Book called the *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs*, was wrote in the Beginning of the second Century by a *Jewish* Christian, as I observed above: and this will appear evident upon a careful Perusal; there being in them many plain Allusions to the Scriptures of the New Testament, and several Expressions taken from them; and even from the latest of them, viz. the Book of the Revelations, and of the Gospel of St. *John*.

The next Year, or the latter End of the foregoing, in the same 86th Year of *Jacob*, or beginning of his 87th Year, in the Year before *Christ* 1852, *Simeon* was born [Ÿ 33.] He lived 120 Years, according to the (3) *Testament* ascribed to him.

In the same Year before *Christ* 1852, and in the 87th Year of *Jacob*, viz. ending, as *Africanus* and *Eusebius* agree, *Levi* was born (Ÿ 34.) and lived 137 Years (4) *Exod.* vi. 16.

The next Year *Judab* was born (Ÿ 35.) in the 88th Year of *Jacob*, and in the Year before *Christ* 1851. He lived 119 Years (5).

All these were the Sons of *Jacob* by *Leab*, who left off bearing for a while.

The next Year, which was the 89th of *Jacob*, and the Year before *Christ* 1850, *Bilbab*, *Rachel's* Maid, bare *Jacob* a Son, whom *Rachel* called *Dan* (*Gen.* xxx. 6.) He lived 124 Years (6).

The next Year, which was the 90th of *Jacob*, and the Year before *Christ* 1849, *Bilbab* bare *Jacob* a second Son, whom *Rachel* called *Naphtali* (Ÿ 8.) He died in the 130th Year of his Age (7). In the same Year *Zilpah*, *Leab's* Maid, bare *Jacob* a Son, whom *Leab* called *Gad* (Ÿ 11.) but he was born after *Naphtali*; and was the seventh Son of *Jacob*, as he says in his (8) *Testament*. He died in the 125th Year (9) of his Age.

The next Year, which was the 91st of *Jacob*, and the Year before *Christ* 1848, *Zilpah*, *Leab's* Maid, bare *Jacob* a second Son, whom *Leab* called *Asher* (*Gen.* xxx. 12, 13.) He died (10) in the 126th Year of his Age. And in the latter End of the same Year *Leab* bare *Jacob* a fifth Son, and called him *Iffachar* (Ÿ 17, 18.) He (11) lived 122 Years.

(3) *Ibid.* p. 157.

(4) *Testament.* *ibid.* sect. 19. fin.

(5) *Test.* *ibid.* sect. 12. et fin.

(6) *Test.* init. *ibid.* p. 204.

(7) *Test.* init. *ibid.* p. 210.

(8) *Init.* p. 217.

(9) *Ibid.*

(10) *Testam.* init. p. 224.

(11) *Testam.* fin. sect. 7. p. 195.

130 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

The next Year, which was the 92^d of *Jacob*, and the Year before *Christ* 1847, *Leab* bare a sixth Son, and called his Name *Zebulan* († 19, 20.) He died (12) in the 114th Year of his Age.

The next Year, which was the 93^d of *Jacob*, and the Year before *Christ* 1846, *Leab* bare a Daughter, and called her Name *Dinab*. And in the same Year *Rachel* conceived and bare a Son, and called his Name *Joseph* [† 21, 22, 23, 24.] He lived 110 Years. *Gen.* i. 22, 26.

Jacob had by his Wives and Concubines eleven Sons and one Daughter, in the space of seven Years. This is plain from *Gen.* xxx. 25, 26. For as soon as *Rachel* had bore *Joseph*, *Jacob* demanded to be dismissed from *Laban's* Service, and to go away with his Wives and Children. *Demetrius* (13) reckons this Term no more than seven Years. *Eusebius* also in his *Chronicon* reckons no more than three Years between the Births of *Judab* and *Joseph*, in which Time he includes the Births of all the other Children: for he placeth the Birth of *Reuben* in the 86th Year of *Jacob*, and the Birth of *Joseph* in his 93^d Year, reckoning all the Term just seven Years.

As the Scripture does not acquaint us with the Time of *Benjamin's* Birth, it is not so easy to settle his Age as those of the other Sons of *Jacob*.

Demetrius (14) makes *Benjamin* eleven Years younger than *Dinab*: and if so, he was born in the 104th Year of *Jacob*, and in the Year before *Christ* 1835.

The *Paschal Chronicle* (15) placeth the Birth of *Benjamin* in the 106th Year of *Jacob*, and in the same Year that *Dinab* was ravished, in the 16th Year of her Age by the Reckoning of this Chronicle; and then he must be born not in the 106th, but in the 108th Year of *Jacob*, and in the Year 1831, before the Vulgar Christian *Æra*.

(12) *Testam. init.* p. 196.

(13) Ἀντὶς τῇ [Ἰακώβ] ὄντα ἐτῶν ἑβδομήκοντα ἐπτά· ἀφελείψαντα δὲ αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ ἐπὶ τὸ ἐτε, Λάβαν δὲ μηρώς δύο θυγατέρας γῆμαι Λείαν καὶ Ραχήλ ὄντα ἐτῶν ὀγδοήκοντα τεσσάρων, καὶ γυνέσθαι ἐν ἐπὶ τῷ ἔτεσιν ἄλλοις αὐτῷ παῖδία ἑβ. Apud *Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ix. c. 21.*

(14) Apud *Euseb. sup.*

(15) P. 60. Edit. Du Fresne.

Levi saies, in the Beginning of his Testament, that he was 20 Years old when *Dinab* was ravished, by which account she was 15 Years of Age as above: and *Benjamin* being born that Year, he must be born in the 108th Year of *Jacob*. This Account seems nearest to the Truth. It appears from Scripture that *Jacob* staid with *Laban*, and served him six Years after the Birth of *Dinab* and *Joseph* (*Gen.* xxxi. 38. 41.) after which he lived about nine Years (*Demetrius* saies ten) at *Succoth*, and at *Shalem* a City of *Shechem*, ch. xxxiii. v. 17, 18. And as it is probable that *Dinab* was full 15 Years of age when she was ravished, and thought marriageable; and *Benjamin* not being born till that Year, or the Year after, he could not be born sooner than I have supposed, or than the 108th Year of *Jacob*, and before *Christ* 1831.

If *Benjamin* then was born in the 108th Year of *Jacob*, he could be no more than 22 Years old when he went into *Egypt*, in the 130th Year of *Jacob*, *Gen.* xlvii. 9. or 23 in his 131st Year, if he was then 130 Years of age. Hence it is not probable that *Benjamin* should have at that time ten Sons born to him, as it is said *Gen.* xlv. 21. This is more probable, if we suppose *Benjamin* born in the 100th Year of *Jacob*, and to be 30 Years old when he went into *Egypt*, as the (16) Testament ascribed to him informs us, and also gives to him 120 Years. But indeed it appears from the History of Scripture, that *Benjamin* was not born till the Year that *Dinab* was ravished, and after the Removal of *Jacob* from *Shalem*, *Gen.* xxxv. 18. and so not till the 108th Year of *Jacob*: and he is spoken of as being unmarried and is called a *Lad* (*παῖδιον* and *παῖδάριον*) *Gen.* xliii. 8. xlv. 33. when he went into *Egypt*. On this account I incline to think that he was married in *Egypt*, and had all his Children there, but during the Lifetime of *Jacob*; and therefore they are numbered with those who went into *Egypt*.

Demetrius (17) saies that *Levi* was 60 Years old when he begat *Cobath*, that is, in the Year before *Christ* 1791. This was, as he saies, 17 Years after *Jacob* went into *Egypt*; so *Jacob*, by this rec-

(16) Init. p. 243.

(17) Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ix. c. 21. p. 425.

konig, went into *Egypt* in the Year before *Christ* 1808, which is the true Year. But in *Gen.* xvi. 11. *Cobath* and his younger Brother *Merari* being numbered with those who went into *Egypt*, it is more probable that *Cobath* was born two or three Years before the Time of *Jacob's* going into *Egypt*. Therefore I place his Birth in the 42^d Year of *Levi*, in the Year before *Christ* 1811. *Cobath* lived 133 Years, *Exod.* vi. 18. and died in the Year before *Christ* 1678.

Cobath was 60 Years old when his Son *Amram* was born, in the Year before *Christ* 1751. *Demetrius* makes *Cobath* no more than 40 Years old at the Birth of *Amram*; but having given 60 Years to *Levi* instead of 40, the two Sums amount to the same, and *Amram* was born 14 Years before the Death of *Joseph*, as he relates.

The *Paschal* and *Oriental Chronicles* and the *Alexandrine Annals* of *Eutychius*, and *Syncellus*, and the *Chronography* of *Nicephorus* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, all agree that *Cobath* was 60 Years old when *Amram* was born; so that *Demetrius* seems to have been mistaken.

Amram was 75 Years old when his Son *Aaron* was born, and 78 when *Moses* was born (for *Aaron* was three Years older than *Moses*, (*Exod.* vii. 7.) So by this Account of *Demetrius*, *Aaron* was born in the Year before *Christ* 1676, and *Moses* in the Year before *Christ* 1673. *Amram* lived 137 Years, *Exod.* vi. 20. and died in the Year before *Christ* 1614. This is the best Account of the Ages of the preceding Patriarchs, the Descendants of *Jacob*; and hence it appears that the Exodus of the *Israelites* from *Egypt* under *Moses*, when he was 80 Years of age, was in the Year before the vulgar Christian *Æra* 1593, and exactly 430 Years after *Abraham* came into the Land of *Canaan* in the Year before *Christ* 2023. And the Genealogy stood as follows.

<i>Year of the World.</i>	<i>Year before Christ.</i>	<i>Born Years after Abraham came into Canaan.</i>	<i>Years collected.</i>
3428	1998	<i>Isaac</i> - - - - 25	0
3488	1938	<i>Jacob</i> - - - - 60	85
3574	1852	<i>Levi</i> - - - - 86	171
3615	1811	<i>Cobath</i> - - - - 41	212
3675	1751	<i>Amram</i> - - - - 60	272
3753	1673	<i>Moses</i> - - - - 78	350
3833	1593	<i>Exodus from Egypt</i> 80	430
		430	

The ancient and modern Chronologers differ in the Times when *Levi*, *Cobath*, *Amram*, and *Moses* were born; but the preceding Account is, I think, the truest, and confirmed by the best and most ancient Evidence.

Concerning the Period from the Israelites going out of Egypt, to the Foundation of the Temple in the fourth Year of the Reign of Solomon.

There is no Period in the Scripture History in which both the ancient and modern Chronologers so much differ and mistake as in this, from the Exodus of the *Israelites* from *Egypt* to the Foundation of *Solomon's Temple*. *Eusebius* has given occasion to most of this Confusion and Difference, by following a groundless Tradition of the *Jews* and including the Times of their Captivities in the Times of their Judges, and thereby shortening this Period an hundred Years.

The modern Chronologers, Archbishop *Usher*, Bishop *Lloyd*, and others, have been led by his Example into the greatest Perplexity and Confusion; and have made successive Times contemporary, and confounded Years of *Rest* and *Bondage* together in an arbitrary manner; to suit a mistaken Hypothesis, and a corrupt Number in *1 Kings vi. 1.* without regard either to the plain Sense of Scripture, or the Judgment of the most ancient Writers *Jewish* and *Christian*: nor have any been hitherto able to clear this *Æra* from the Difficulties with which it is embarrassed, or to settle the true Number of Years which it contains. I shall therefore endeavour to set this Period in a true and clear Light by following the plain Narration and Sense of Scripture concerning the times of the Judges and of the several Captivities which intervened, and shall distinguish the Years of the one from those of the other; and I shall also demonstrate that the Number in *1 Kings vi. 1.* which makes this Period no more than 479 Years, is a *Jewish* Interpolation or Corruption, and was not known to the ancient *Jewish* and *Christian* Writers.

When *Joshua* and *Eleazar* the High Priest were about to divide the Land of *Canaan* amongst the Tribes of the Children of *Israel*, *Caleb* tells *Joshua* (*Josh. xiv. 7, 10.*) “ that he was forty Years old “ when *Moses* sent him from *Kadesh-Barnea* to espy out the Land —

“ and that the Lord had kept him alive forty and five Years, since that time, and that he was then fourscore and five Years old.” *Caleb* was sent for the Tribe of *Judab* to search the Land in the second Year after the *Israelites* came out of *Egypt* (*Numb.* x. 11. xiii. 6.) So *Caleb* being 79 Years old at the Death of *Moses* and the beginning of the Government of *Joshua*, it is evident that six Years had been spent in conquering the Land of *Canaan*, and the Land was divided in the seventh (18) Year: and so it was in the first sabbatical Year; and the next, which was the first of cultivating the Land, was the first Year both of the sabbatical and Jubilean Cycles, which commenced in the Year 1545 before the Christian Æra.

Josephus (19) saies *Joshua* spent five Years in conquering the Land of *Canaan*, and died in the 20th Year after the Division of the Land, and governed the *Israelites* 25 Years after the Death of *Moses*: so the Division of the Land according to *Josephus* began in the sixth Year of the Government of *Joshua*, and ended in the seventh.

How long *Joshua* lived after the Division of the Land of *Canaan* amongst the Tribes of *Israel* is no where related in Scripture. It is only said in general (*Josh.* xxiii. 1.) that *a long Time after that the Lord had given rest unto Israel from all their Enemies round about, that Joshua waxed old and stricken in Age.* So that the learned (20) *Ludovicus Capellus* is mistaken in supposing *Joshua* to die presently after the Division of the Land of *Canaan*, contrary to the plain meaning of this Text. The ancient *Jewish* and Christian Writers generally agreed in reckoning no more than 25 Years for the Government of *Joshua* after the Death of *Moses*, or 27 Years from the Death of *Moses* to the first Servitude of the *Israelites* under the King of *Mesopotamia*, not allowing any time for the Government of the Elders after *Joshua*.

Josephus above-cited saies, that *Joshua* died 19 Years after the Division of the Land, or in the 26th Year after the Death of *Moses*.

(18) So the *Chronicon Paschale*.

(19) *Antiq. Jud.* lib. v. c. 1. § 19. see the Notes there. Also § 28, 29.

(20) *Chronolog. Sac.* p. 146.

Africanus (21) gives the same Number of Years to his Government: but (22) *Eupolemus* saies that after the Death of *Moses Joshua* governed thirty Years. *Clemens Alexandrinus* saies (23) that after the Death of *Moses Joshua* succeeded him in the Government of the People, and was engaged in Wars for 65 [ξε'] Years, and afterwards enjoyed Peace in the good Land of *Canaan* for 25 Years. Here it is evident, though the learned Editor has not observed it, that *Clemens* wrote not *sixty-five Years* but *five Years* only; which is the Term that *Josephus* gives to the Wars of *Joshua*, and so the whole Term from the Death of *Moses* to the Death of *Joshua* was 30 Years, agreeably to the Account of *Eupolemus* and some other ancient Writers. But *Clemens* adds, that according to the Account in the Book of *Joshua*, he succeeded *Moses* and held the Government 27 Years; and after that the *Hebrews* sinned, and were delivered into the Hands of the King of *Mesopotamia* for eight Years. *Theophilus* Bishop of *Antioch*, who was a learned Chronologer, and some Years older than *Clemens* of *Alexandria* (24), agrees that *Joshua* presided over the People of *Israel* after the Death of *Moses* for 27 Years, to their first Servitude. *Eusebius* (25) tells us, that some reckoned that *Joshua* governed the Tribes of *Israel* for 30 Years after the Death of *Moses*; and that after this they were subject to Strangers eight Years, as it is related *Jud.* iii. 8. *Eusebius* means *Eupolemus*, etc. But he reckons in his Chronicon from *Africanus* the Term of *Joshua's* Government no more than 27 Years, and allowed no Time for the Government of the Elders after him, as *Syncellus* (26) observes, but included them in the Years of *Joshua*. The *Paschal Chronicle* (27), *Augustine*, and (28) *Sulpicius Severus* agree to reckon this Term of *Joshua's* Government no more than 27 Years.

That some Time passed between the Death of *Joshua* and the first Servitude of the *Israelites* under the King of *Mesopotamia*, may be in-

(21) Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. x. c. 10.

(22) Ibid. lib. ix. c. 30. init.

(23) Strom. i. p. 384. Edit. Potter.

(24) Ad Autolyc. lib. iii.

(25) Præp. Evang. lib. x. c. 14.

(26) Chronograph. p. 174.

(27) De Civ. Dei. lib. xviii. c. 11.

(28) Hist. Sac. lib. i. c. 44.

ferred from the Wars and Conquests of the *Israelites* mentioned in the first Chapter of the Book of *Judges*, and also from its being said, ch. ii. § 7. *That the People served the Lord all the Days of Joshua, and all the Days of the Elders who outlived Joshua.* How many Years these Elders governed we read not; it is indeed evident that they had no proper Rule at all after the Death of *Joshua*. *Josephus* saies (29) that the *Israelites* had no civil Government among them for 18 Years after the Death of *Joshua* to the first Judge *Othniel*: and within this Time he includes the Transactions of *Jud.* ch. i. and the former Part of the second Chapter; and after them those of the xviiith, xixth, xxth, and xxist Chapters; to which time also belong the Transactions of the xviith Chapter, omitted by *Josephus*. After this *Josephus* proceeds to the Contents of the third and following Chapters. It is plain that all things related in these Chapters happened before the *Israelites* had any judge: for it is frequently said, that there was then *no King or Judge in Israel.* ch. xvii. § 6. ch. xviii. § 1. ch. xix. 1. ch. xxi. § 25. And it is also plain that the *Israelites* had no other Rulers but the High Priest, and the Elders, who are called *the chief of all the People, or of all the Tribes.* ch. xx. § 2. by whom their Wars were conducted. So the Transactions related in the forementioned Chapters must happen in the Interval between the Death of *Joshua* and the first Servitude under the King of *Mesopotamia*. And farther, that this is the true Order of Time in the Book of *Judges* is plain from *Phineas*, the Son of *Eleazar*, being High Priest, ch. xx. § 28. who succeeded his Father about the Time of *Joshua's* Death, ch. xxiv. § 33. and so could not be alive after the Death of *Samson*, after which the History contained in the xviith, xviiith, xixth, xxth, and xxist Chapters is placed in the present Copies. These Observations deserve the Attention of the Reader.

But as the Transactions shewn to be precedent to the first Servitude of the *Israelites* do not require the Space of ten Years, as *Josephus* makes them; or more than about two Years; and all the Matters, except the Wars mentioned in the first Chapter, might happen during their being tributary to the King of *Mesopotamia*; so it is most probable

(29) *Antiq. Jud.* lib. v. c. 2, 3.

that soon after the Death of *Joshua*, the *Israelites* having no King, or chief civil Magistrate to controul them, began not only to quarrel and fight with one another, but also to forsake the Lord their God, and to serve *Baalim*, the Gods of the *Canaanites*, and other Nations, amongst whom they dwelt, *Jud.* ii. 10, 11. c. iii. v. 6. And in the Text, *Jud.* ii. 7. where it is said, *that the People served the Lord all the Days of Joshua, and all the Days of the Elders who outlived Joshua*; the Greek has it, *the Elders who lived long, or to an old Age*, [μετὰ ἡσυχίας] *with Joshua*: and the *Hebrew Word* rendered *after*, signifies also *with*; and so *Eusebius* understood it, and therefore reckoned no Time for the Government of Elders after *Joshua*. Nor is it probable that any of the same Generation with *Joshua*, should live long after him, who was an hundred and ten Years of Age when he died, v. 8. and *Jos.* xxiv. 29. And it is added immediately after the Mention of his Death and Burial, v. 10. that *Also all that Generation were gathered unto their Fathers: and there arose another Generation after them which knew not the Lord*. Which Words imply that soon after the Death of *Joshua*, the Children of *Israel* began to (30) forsake the Law of their God, and to indulge themselves in Licentiousness and Idolatry. So that I think *Eusebius* is right in not assigning any Years of Government of Elders after the Death of *Joshua*; and that twenty seven Years which *Theophilus* of *Antioch*, and *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, and the *Paschal Chronicle* assigned for the Time of *Joshua's* Government, and to the Conquest and Captivity of the *Israelites*, by the King of *Mesopotamia*, is the whole Term which ought to be given to that Period. This being admitted as most probable, the Series of Years from the *Israelites* going out of *Egypt*, to the Foundation of the Temple, will stand as follows.

From the Exodus to the Death of *Moses*, are reckoned 40 Years; thence to the Death of *Joshua*, and the first Servitude, were 27 Years; of which six were spent in conquering the seven Nations, and one in dividing their Land amongst the Tribes of *Israel*; and *Joshua* lived 18

(30) Defuncto Jesu Nave, derelinquunt Deum patrum suorum, et serviunt idolis Baalim et Astartis. Tertul. adv. Gnost. c. iii.

Years after this, and died in the 19th Year after the Division, and governed the *Israelites* twenty five Years to his Death, as *Josephus* and *Africanus* computed. After the Death of *Josbua* there was an Interregnum and Anarchy for *two* Years, in which the *Israelites* had no civil Governor; but every Thing was directed by the Advice of the High Priest and the Elders of the People. This is evident from the first Chapter of the Book of *Judges*; and from what is related in the 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th, and 21st Chapters, the History of which all happened, as appears, between the Death of *Josbua*, and the first Servitude under the King of *Mesopotamia*. After this, the *Israelites* inter-marrying with the idolatrous Nations whom they suffered to dwell amongst them, and serving their Gods, were by divine Providence, delivered into the Hand of *Chusan* (31) *Rishathaim*, King of *Mesopotamia*, and of *Affyria*, (rather *Syria*) as *Josephus* calls him: and they served him eight Years, *Jud.* iii. 6, 7, 8. After this, upon their Repentance and returning to the Worship of the true God; *Othniel the Son of Kenaz, Caleb's younger Brother*, judged *Israel* and delivered them, and slew *Chusan-Rishathaim* in Battle: and under his Government the Land had Rest or Peace forty (32) Years, ✽ 9, 10, 11.

After the Death of *Othniel*, *Eglon* King of *Moab* subdued the *Israelites*, and made them tributary, and they served him 18 Years ✽ 14. Then *Ehud* a *Benjamite* privately slew *Eglon*, and delivered the Children of *Israel* from their Servitude under the *Moabites*: and their Land enjoyed a Peace of 80 Years, ✽ 30. After the Death of *Ehud*, *Shamgar* delivered *Israel* from an Invasion of the *Philistines*, ✽ 31. But he did not judge the *Israelites* a whole Year, as *Josephus* tells us. So his Time is either included in the 80 Years of *Ehud*, or in the fol-

(21) That is, the *wicked Chusan*, as the Oriental Chronicle interprets the Name.

(22) The Alex. MS. Clem. Alex. and Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. x. c. 14. and Sulpicius Severus Hist. Sac. lib. i. c. 45. give 50 Years to the Government of *Othniel*: but the *Hebrew*, and the *Roman* and *Aldine Greek* Copies with the Vulg. Syr. Arab. and Chald. Par. and *Josephus*, *Theophilus* of *Antiech.* Euseb. in Chron. and *Syncellus*, all agree in 40 Years, which is the true Number. The Difference arose from the Similitude of the numeral Letters M and N.

lowing 20 Years Servitude, as seems to be hinted ch. v. § 6. where it is said, *that in the Days of Shamgar the high Ways were unoccupied.* And he is wholly omitted by *Theophilus* Bishop of *Antioch*, and *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, and *Eusebius*: and had he ruled a Year or more, it would, no Doubt, have been mentioned in the Text. But he is no farther taken Notice of, than having slain six hundred *Philistines* with an Ox Goad; and it is immediately added, that, after the Death of *Ehud*, the *Israelites* fell under an oppressive Servitude to *Jabin* King of *Canaan*, for twenty Years, c. iv. § 1, 2, 3. Then *Deborah*, a Prophetess judged *Israel*, and delivered them with the Assistance of *Barak*, who discomfited *Jabin's* Army; and the Land had Rest 40 Years, c. v. § 31. After this the *Israelites* served the *Midianites* seven Years, ch. vi. § 1. *Gideon* delivered them, and subdued the *Midianites*, and the Country was in Quietness forty Years in the Days of *Gideon*, ch. viii. § 28. After the Death of *Gideon*, *Abimelech* reigned over *Israel* 3 Years, and was slain, ch. ix. § 22, &c. After *Abimelech*, *Tola* judged *Israel* 22 Years, ch. x. § 2. The Copies, *Hebrew*, *Greek*, &c. have 23 Years; but *Theophilus* Bishop of *Antioch*, and *Eusebius* in his *Chronicon*, and *Sulpicius Severus*, and *Maximus* the Martyr, in his ecclesiastical Computation, give him no more than 22 Years; and this seems to be the true Number. The Name of this Judge is omitted in *Josephus*, by the Carelessness of his Transcriber, for his Years are included in the total Sum of his Computation of 592 Years, from the Exodus to the Temple, as will appear in his Catalogue of the Judges. After *Tola*, *Jair* judged *Israel* 22 Years, § 3. After the Death of *Jair* the *Philistines* and *Ammonites* oppressed *Israel* 18 Years, § 8. After this *Jephthah* delivered them and was Judge six Years, ch. xii. § 7. After him *Ibzan* of *Betlehem* judged *Israel* seven Years, § 8, 9. After *Ibzan*, *Elon* judged *Israel* ten Years, § 11. After him *Abdon* was Judge 8 Years, § 13, 14. *Josephus* saies nothing of the Time of the Government of this Judge, and reckons it in the Years of *Elon* [*Antiq. Jud. lib. v. c. 7.*] After the Death of *Abdon* the *Jews* were subject to the *Philistines* forty Years, ch. xiii. § 1. In twenty Years of which Servitude *Samson* was their Judge: for he is said to have judged *Israel* in the Days of the *Philistines* twenty Years, ch. xv. § 20. And though

this is evident in the plain Sense of the Text, yet all the christian Writers, and even *Josepbus*, have reckoned the 20 Years of *Samson's* Government, to succeed the forty Years of the *Philistine* Servitude. Contemporary with *Samson*, and after his Death, *Eli* the High Priest was Judge of *Israel* 40 Years, 1 *Sam.* iv. 18. This is the Reading of the *Hebrew* and *Josepbus*; and also of the *Vulgate Latin*, the *Chaldee Paraphrase*, the *Syriac* and *Arabic* Versions. But most of the *Greek* Copies have only 20 Years with the *Alexandrian* and *Vatican* Manuscripts: and so read *Theophilus* Bishop of *Antioch*, and *Sulpicius Severus*, and *Procopius* of *Gaza*. And *Eusebius* in his *Chronicon*, and *Syncellus* from him (p. 176.) saies that the *Septuagint* had no more than 20 Years, though the *Hebrew* had 40, which Number he there follows, and also in his *Præparatio Evangelica* [lib. x. c. 14.] but that some ancient *Greek* Copies had 40 Years, appears from *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, and the *Paschal* and *Oriental* Chronicles having this Number: and the MSS. of *Aldus* had the same Number. The *Complutense* Edition has also 40 Years; but this Copy is evidently in many Places made to conform to the *Latin Vulgate*; and so we can seldom be sure of the genuine Readings of the MSS. made use of in that Edition, but when they differ from the *Vulgate*. *Josepbus* and the ancient *Hebrew* Copies, agreeing with some ancient *Greek* Copies, seem to determine the Time of the Government of *Eli* to have been *forty* Years; and if *Eli* judged *Israel* along with *Samson* the last twenty Years of their Servitude under the *Philistines*, and twenty Years more after the Death of *Samson*; the 20 Years of the *Seventy Interpreters* ascribed to *Eli*, were those in which he undoubtedly judged *Israel* alone, after the Death of *Samson*. But if he was Judge only after the Death of *Samson*, as *Josepbus* and all the ancient Christian Writers suppose, the Reading of the *Greek* Version of the *Septuagint* must be right, and *Eli* judged *Israel* no more than twenty Years. The Truth, I think, is, that *Eli* was both High Priest and Judge during the last 20 Years of the *Israelites* being subject to the *Philistines*, in which Time *Samson* also judged them; and was Judge alone 20 Years after the Death of *Samson*: and after his Death there was an Interregnum, in which the *Israelites* had no civil Governor for 20 Years and 7 Months, as will
be

be fully proved; and instead of this Interregnum several of the Ancients gave 40 Years to *Eli* after the Death of *Samson*, and so proceeded in their Computation from *Eli* to *Samuel*, though it appears plain from Scripture, as will be shewn, that there was between the Death of *Eli* and the Government of *Samuel* as Judge of *Israel* an Interval of 20 Years and seven Months. The Time of *Samuel* being Judge before *Saul* was chosen to be King, and the Time of *Saul's* Reign make 40 Years. This is not any where expressly related in the History of the Old Testament, and therefore ancient Writers differ in this Matter. *Josephus* makes the Sum of both their Governments to be no more than 32 Years: of these he gives to *Samuel* 12 Years before the Election of *Saul* to be King; and 18 to *Saul* during the Life-time of *Samuel*, and two more after his Death. *Eupolemus*, who wrote about the Year before *Christ* 174, saies that (33) *Saul* died in the 21st Year of his Reign; but does not tell us how many Years *Samuel* was Judge before him. But as *Eusebius* (34) reckons 40 Years for the Government of *Samuel* and *Saul*, it is probable that he found *Eupolemus* had given them the same Number of Years. *Theophilus* the ancient Bishop of *Antioch* agrees with *Josephus*, and assigns 12 Years to *Samuel* and 20 to *Saul*. *Clemens Alexandrinus* gives no more than 29 Years to both of them; of which *Samuel* judged *Israel* alone 9 Years; and he saies that *Saul* reigned 20 Years after the Kingdom was renewed or confirmed to him, as it is related 1 *Sam.* xi. 14, 15. The *Paschal Chronicle* gives 20 Years to *Samuel*, and the same to *Saul*: and that the Time of both their Governments made 40 Years we are assured by St. *Paul*, *Acts* xiii. 20, 21. who having said that God gave the *Israelites* Judges about the Space of 450 Years unto *Samuel* the Prophet; he adds immediately: and afterwards they desired a King, and God gave unto them *Saul* the Son of *Cis*, a Man of the Tribe of *Benjamin*, by the Space of 40 Years; reckoning plainly these 40 Years for the entire Government of *Samuel* and *Saul*, and to commence after the 450 Years of the Judges preceding *Samuel*. And as the Ancients both *Jewish* and Christian Writers unanimously agree, as before ob-

(33) Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ix. c. 30.

(34) Ibid. lib. x. c. 14.

served, that *Saul* reigned 20 Years and no more, we must assign 20 Years also to the distinct and prior Government of *Samuel*. But a Difficulty arises about the Time of *Samuel's* succeeding *Eli*, and being Judge of the children of *Israel*. He was too young to judge *Israel* immediately upon the Death of *Eli*: for he is said *to be a Child when he ministered to the Lord before Eli*, 1 Sam. iii. 1. *Josephus* saies he was no more than (35) *twelve Years of age*. The Text adds, that *Eli* was then *very old*, being *ninety and eight Years of age*, and his *Eyes were dim that he could not see*, 1 Sam. iv. 15. Immediately after his Death is related, which seems to have happened either in the same Year when it was revealed to *Samuel*, or the Year after; *Josephus* (36) saies it was about the same time. *Samuel* therefore could not be able to judge the People of *Israel* immediately after the Death of *Eli*: and if it could be supposed that he was Judge of *Israel* at twelve or thirteen Years of age, yet as he judged the *Israelites* no more than 20 Years before that by God's Appointment he anointed *Saul* to be King; this Age of 32 or 33 Years is not consistent with his being said at that time *to be old*, and to have Sons old enough *to be Judges over Israel*. 1 Sam. viii. 1—5. Therefore it is evident that there was an Interregnum of several Years between the Death of *Eli* and *Samuel's* judging the People of *Israel*. The Time of this Interregnum is plainly pointed out to us in Scripture. The Ark of the Lord which was taken by the *Philistines* at the Time of *Eli's* Death, was kept in their Country *seven Months*, 1 Sam. vi. 1. After this it was brought by the Men of *Kirjath-Jearim*, and placed in the House of *Abinadab*, where it abode twenty Years, ch. vii. § 1, 2. And after this it is related that *Samuel* gathered all *Israel* together to *Mizpeh*, and there became their Judge by universal Consent, § 5, 6. So that the first mention of *Samuel* judging the Children of *Israel* was at *Mizpeh*, 20 Years and seven Months after the Death of *Eli*. He was now 32 or 33 Years of age; and having been Judge 20 Years, he, at the instance of the People and by the Command of God, chose *Saul* to be their King. *Samuel* being now 53 Years of Age, and in the Decline of Life,

(35) Antiq. Jud. lib. v. c. 10.

(36) Ibid. c. 11.

might properly be said to be (37) *old*, ch. viii. *v* 15. and might, have had Sons some Years before capable to assist him in the Administration of Justice: and yet he was not then very old, because he lived 18 Years after he had anointed *Saul* to be King, and died only two Years before him.

This Difficulty concerning the Age and Government of *Samuel* before *Saul* was made King, which is the most considerable one relating to the foregoing Chronology, and never yet was cleared, that I know of, by any ancient or modern Chronologer is wholly removed by the 20 Years and seven Months Interregnum between the Death of *Eli* and *Samuel's* beginning to judge *Israel* in *Mizpeh*: and which is not only necessary to be supposed on Account of *Samuel* being so young as to be called a Child at the Death of *Eli*; but is moreover implied in the the Scripture History itself, which never mentions *Samuel* to have judged *Israel* (though he was known to be a *Prophet* before) till above 20 Years after the Death of *Eli*. Therefore instead of an Interregnum of 40 Years between *Samson* and *Eli*, which some of the ancient Christian Writers, as *Theophilus* Bishop of *Antioch*, the *Paschal Chronicle*, *Syncellus*, and *Cedrenus*, inserted from some fabulous Jewish Traditions; but which is not taken notice of by *Josephus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and *Eusebius*; instead of this Interregnum which has no Foundation in Scripture, the Interval of 20 Years and 7 Months between (38) *Eli* and *Samuel* makes the sacred History clear and entire.

Here I cannot but observe that the Chronology of the learned Archbishop *Usher*, and also the Chronological Tables of Bishop *Llboyd* pub-

(37) *Hippocrates* reckoned a Man *πρεσβύτης*, *aged*, or to be within the Term of old Age from 49 to 56 Years of Age. *πρεσβύτης ἄρχει πενήκοντα ἔξ — πρὸ δ' ἐπ'εὖθεν γέρον.* Apud Phil. Jud. de Mund. Opificio, p. 24. See Macrobius in Somn. Scip. lib. i. c. 6. p. 28, 29. and Iren. adv. Hæres. lib. ii. c. 22. p. 148. Edit. Benedict.

(38) I find this Interval of 20 Years between the Death of *Eli* and the Government of *Samuel* observed by an unknown Author of the *Hebraic Questions* upon the first Book of *Kings*, inserted amongst the Works of *Jerome*, vol. ii. p. 15. Edit. Benedict. His Words are: A tempore quo reprobatum est sacerdotium Eli usque ad Samuelis ducatum viginti fuerunt anni miseriarum referti: peracto vicesimo anno, translata est eadem arca a Samuele in Masphat, etc.

lished

lished by Mr. *Marshal*, are a mere confused and ungrounded Hypothesis, and wholly unsupported by and inconsistent with the Scripture History in the entire Account of the Successions of *Samson*, *Eli*, and *Samuel*, as also in the whole Series of the Times of the Judges. The Ground of their Errors will be hereafter laid open.

Saul, as before observed from the concurrent Evidence and Testimony of the ancient *Jewish* and Christian Writers, reigned 20 Years and no more; yet our most learned modern Chronologers, and especially *Usher* and *Lloyd*, make *Saul* reign 40 Years exclusive of the Time that *Samuel* was Judge before he was chosen to be King. This Pretence is grounded on its being said that *Saul* was a *young Man* when he was anointed King by *Samuel*, 1 *Sam.* ix. 2. and it appears from 2 *Sam.* ii. 10. that at the Death of *Saul* his Son *Ishbosheth* was *forty Years old*; and yet he was *Saul's* fourth Son, called *Esh-Baal*, 1 *Cbron.* viii. 33. or his second Son, called *Ishui*, 1 *Sam.* xiv. 49. To this the Answer is; that though *Saul* be called a *young Man* in the *English* Translation, the *Hebrew* Word *Babur*, or *Bacbur*, signifies a Man of full Age, one *chosen* and fit for Action; a *choice Man* (*electus inter viros*) this is the true Sense of the Word. It is rendered from the *Hebrew* by *Jerome* or the *Vulgate*, a *choice* or *chosen Man*; and so in the *Syriac* and *Arabic* Versions: and the *Septuagint* renders it, a *lusty Man* (*Εμεγέθης*.) *Josephus* indeed calls him a *Youth*; but it is evident he could not be much less than 40 Years of age when he was chosen King. For in the beginning of his Reign, when he had ruled but (39) *two Years over Israel*, his eldest Son *Jonathan* was fit for War, and commanded a Body of a *thousand Men*, with whom he smote a *Garrison*

(39) So the *Hebrew* and *Latin* *Vulgate* have it to which the *Complutense* Copy of the *Greek* agrees, and was probably made to conform to them: for the *Vatican*, *Alexandrian*, *Aldine*, and other *Greek* MSS. had not the first Verse: nor does *Josephus* take the least notice of it; but begins *Saul's* History with the second Verse. So that this Verse seems to have been added after the Time of *Josephus*, and when *Symmachus*, who read it, made his *Greek* Version. But yet it is evident that this Relation of *Saul's* chusing out of the Men of *Israel* 3000 Men for his own and Son *Jonathan's* Guards was either in the first or second Year after the Kingdom was renewed and confirmed to him in *Gilgal*; and this is also supposed by *Josephus*, *Antiq. Jud.* l. b. vi. c. 6.

of the Philistines. 1 Sam. xiii. 1, 2, 3. Therefore Jonathan might probably be then 24 or 25 Years of Age: so that Ishbosheth might be 20 Years of Age when Saul began to reign. But it is to be observed, that the Verse 2 Sam. ii. 10. where Ishbosheth Saul's Son is said to be *forty Years old, when he began to reign over Israel* upon the Death of his Father, is omitted with the following Verse by Josephus (40) who mentions all the rest of the Contents of the Chapter. And as this 10th Verse where Ishbosheth's Age is mentioned, seems to be the Gloss of some ancient Scholiast afterwards inserted into the Text, so the following 11th Verse seems plainly to be added here from ch. v. § 5.

After the Death of Saul all agree that David reigned forty Years; and in the fourth Year of the Reign of his Son Solomon, and in the second Month, the Foundation of the Temple was laid, 1 Kings vi. 1. 2 Chron. iii. 2. Therefore the Years from the Exodus of the Israelites, or their going out of Egypt, to the Foundation of Solomon's Temple, are upon the foregoing Evidence, to be reckoned as follows, viz.

	Years of Government.	Years of the World.	Years before Christ.
From the Exodus to the Death of Moses	40	3833	1593
Joshua 25, and an Interregnum 2 Years.	27	3873	1553
First Servitude under Chusan-Rishathaim	8	3900	1526
After this Othniel was Judge — —	40	3908	1518
Second Servitude under the Moabites	18	3948	1478
After this Ehud was Judge — —	80	3966	1460
Shamgar was Judge almost a Year, reckoned in the Years of Ehud	0	0	0
Third Servitude under the Canaanites —	20	4046	1380
After this Debora and Barak — — —	40	4066	1360
Fourth Servitude under the Madianites	7	4106	1320
After this Gideon was Judge —	40	4113	1313
After Gideon Abimelech was Judge —	3	4153	1273
After him Tola was Judge — —	22	4156	1270
After Tola Jair was Judge —	22	4178	1248
Fifth Servitude under the Ammonites —	18	4200	1226

(40) Antiq. Jud. lib. vii. c. 1.

VOL. I.

U

After

	Years of Government.	Years of the World.	Years before Christ.
After this <i>Jephthab</i> was Judge — —	6	4218	1208
After <i>Jephthab</i> <i>Ibzan</i> was Judge —	7	4224	1202
After <i>Ibzan</i> <i>Elon</i> was Judge — —	10	4231	1195
After <i>Elon</i> <i>Abdon</i> (41) was Judge —	8	4241	1185
Sixth Servitude under the <i>Philistines</i>			
in the latter 20 Years of which <i>Samson</i> and <i>Eli</i> were Judges together (42) —	40	4249	1177
<i>Eli</i> was Judge 40 Years, but 20 of them with <i>Samson</i> under the sixth Servitude	20	4289	1137
After <i>Eli</i> an Interregnum 20 Years and 7 Months — —	20	4309	1117
After the Interregnum <i>Samuel</i> was Judge	20	4329	1097
After <i>Samuel</i> had judged <i>Israel</i> 20 Years, <i>Saul</i> reigned — —	20	4349	1077
After <i>Saul</i> <i>David</i> reigned — —	40	4369	1057
In the fourth Year of <i>Solomon</i> and the second Month the Temple was begun —	3	4409	1017
Sum	579		

By the Computation above, the Temple was begun 579 Years after the Exodus, and in the Year of the World 4412, and in the Year before the Christian Æra 1014. There were besides seven Months more which I have mentioned, but have not reckoned, to keep the Numbers in entire Years: and this is sufficiently exact. It is certain from the Scripture Account of the Times of the Judges, that the Term from the Exodus to the Temple could not be fewer Years than I have computed them: but yet we find in the present *Hebrew* Copies of 1 *Kings* vi. 1. That it came to pass in the four hundred and fourscore Year af-

(41) *Eusebius* placeth the taking of *Troy* under the third Year of *Abdon*, whom he calls *Labdon* in his *Chronicon*; and this agrees exactly to my Chronology: for *Troy* was taken in the Year before *Christ*, 1183.

(42) It appears from the xiii^d Chapter of the Book of *Judges*, that *Samson* was born the first Year of the *Philistine* Servitude, and therefore the 20 Years in this Servitude, in which he is said to have judged *Israel*, ch. xv. v. 20. must be the last 20 Years of it.

ter the Children of Isaael were come out of the Land of Egypt, in the fourth Year of Solomon's Reign over Israel, in the Month Zif, which is the second Month, that he began to build the House of the Lord. This Number has puzzled all our modern Chronologers, and put them to make several absurd Hypotheses, in order to reconcile the History of the Judges to it: but it gave no Trouble to the most ancient Jewish and Christian Chronologers; because they found no such Number either in the Hebrew or Greek Copies. And as they had no other Rule to compute this famous Æra by, but only the Years of the Judges; in which Calculation there was Room for the Difference of a few Years, in the Times of some of them, which are not expressly set down in Scripture, as I have observed: so accordingly we find that some Writers made this Term from the Exodus to the Temple more Years than others did; but not one of them followed the Number mentioned in the before-cited Text, or made it 479 Years, till *Eusebius* mentioned its being wrote in the first Book of *Kings*; whereas had this Number been originally there, it would undoubtedly have appeared in the Version of the Septuagint; and the ancient Greek Writers would have followed it unanimously and without Variation. That this Number is spurious, and a Corruption of the Text, where it is written, will be demonstrably shown in the following Sheets. And that it was not originally either in the Hebrew or Greek Text, may with great Certainty be inferred from the Computations of all the Ancients, both Pagan, Jewish, and Christian Writers. *Theophilus* the ancient Bishop of *Antioch* (43) saies, that it appeared from the *Tyrian* Records, that *Solomon's* Temple was built five hundred sixty six Years after the Exodus. These Records *Josephus* speaks of as of great Antiquity and Authority: and they differed no more than thirteen Years from my Calculation, and cannot be supposed to be so exact as the Scripture History is in the Jewish Affairs.

In a Calculation from the Barbarians, as (44) *Clemens* of *Alexandria* calls the Ethnic Writers; and which seems to be the Calculation of

(43) Ad Autolyc. lib. iii. p. 131.

(44) Strom. i. p. 337.

Demetrius who wrote in the Time of *Ptolemy Philopator*, the History of the *Jewish* Kings; there are reckoned from the Division of the Land, and thence from the Judges, including *Joshua* to *Samuel*, 463 Years and 7 Months: so these 463 Years and 7 Months, commenced 46 Years after the Exodus: and so by this ancient Account collected from the *Greek* Version of the Septuagint, the Sum of the Years from the Exodus to the Temple was 463, 7 Months, + 46 + 83 Years, or 592 Years and 7 Months; which agrees exactly with the Account of *Josephus* which is 592 Years, as will be shewn presently.

Josephus had no Number in his *Hebrew* Copy of the Book of *Kings*: because as he never fails to mention his Chronological Numbers, he would undoubtedly have taken notice of this, had it been in his Copy, and would also have made his Computation by it. But in the Place where he gives the Account of the building of the Temple he saies: “*Solomon* (45) began to build the Temple in the fourth Year of his Reign, in the second Month, after 592 Years from the Exodus of the *Israelites* out of *Egypt*.” Could *Josephus* have said this, if he had found in the Text the Number 480, as it is found at present? and that 592 is the genuine Number of *Josephus* (though he has 612 Years in two or three other Places) is evident from several Observations made before on his Chronology; and chiefly from the distinct particular Numbers of the Years of *Joshua*, and of every Judge, set down in his fifth Book of *Antiquities*, and which stand as follows, *viz.*

	Years.
From the Exodus to the Death of <i>Moses</i> ———	40
From the Death of <i>Moses</i> to the Death of <i>Joshua</i> ———	25
The Government of the Elders after <i>Joshua</i> , in whose Time the <i>Israelites</i> were subject to the King of <i>Mesopotamia</i> eight Years,	18
<i>Antiq.</i> vi. c. 5. sect. 4. p. 322. ———	
After this, <i>Othniel</i> was Judge ———	40
After the Death of <i>Othniel</i> they were subject to the <i>Moabites</i>	18
After this, <i>Ehud</i> delivered them, and was Judge ———	80

(45) *Antiq. Jud.* lib. viii. c. 3.

After

	Years.
After the Death of <i>Ehud</i> , <i>Shamgar</i> was chosen Judge, but died in the first Year of his Government	1
After this the <i>Israelites</i> were in Servitude under <i>Jabin</i> King of <i>Canaan</i>	20
<i>Debora</i> and <i>Barak</i> delivered them, and judged <i>Israel</i>	40
After the Death of <i>Debora</i> and <i>Barak</i> , who both died about the same Time, the <i>Madianites</i> oppressed them with hard Servitude	7
<i>Gideon</i> delivered them, and was Judge	40
After <i>Gideon</i> <i>Abimelech</i> ruled	3
After <i>Abimelech</i> <i>Tola</i> judged <i>Israel</i>	22
This Judge is omitted in <i>Josephus</i> by the Carelessness of his Copier; but the Sum of the Years, as he reckoned them from the Exodus to the Temple, shews that he had <i>Tola</i> , and the Number of the Years of his Government.	
After <i>Tola</i> <i>Jair</i> was Judge	22
After the Death of <i>Jair</i> the <i>Israelites</i> were in Servitude under the <i>Philistines</i> and <i>Ammonites</i>	18
<i>Jephtha</i> delivered them, and judged <i>Israel</i>	6
After the Death of <i>Jephthab</i> <i>Ibzan</i> was Judge	7
After <i>Ibzan</i> <i>Elon</i> was Judge	10
Contemporary with <i>Elon</i> <i>Abdon</i> was Judge, according to the Account of <i>Josephus</i> , who set down no Years to his Go- vernment (46).	
After the Death of <i>Abdon</i> the <i>Philistines</i> held the <i>Israelites</i> un- der Tribute	40
After this, <i>Samson</i> judged <i>Israel</i>	20
After the Death of <i>Samson</i> the High Priest <i>Eli</i> was Judge	40
After the Death of <i>Eli</i> <i>Samuel</i> judged <i>Israel</i> alone	12
<i>Samuel</i> judged <i>Israel</i> 18 Years more in the Reign of <i>Saul</i> , Antiq. Jud. lib. vi. c. 13.	18

(46) The MSS. of *Josephus* make *Abdon* succeed *Elon*: they say he was Governor μετ' Ἡλῶνα, after *Elon*: but as no Years are set down of his ruling after *Elon*; I should chuse to read μετὰ Ἡλῶν or Ἡλῶνός, i. e. with *Elon*, as two Copies, viz. *Basil*, and another marked G. i. e. Edit. Genev. have it.

	Years.
<i>Saul</i> reigned 2 Years after the Death of <i>Samuel</i> , Antiq. Jud. vi. } 2	
c. 14. fin. ——— ——— ——— ——— }	
After <i>Saul</i> <i>David</i> reigned ——— ——— ——— ———	40
In the fourth of <i>Solomon</i> the Temple was begun to be builded	3
	<hr/>
Sum total	592

This Number of 592 Years, which *Josepbus* reckoned from the *Israelites* going out of *Egypt* to the building of the Temple in the fourth Year of the Reign of *Solomon*, is agreeable to his (47) Computation of 515 Years from the Government of *Joshua* after the Death of *Moses* to the Time of *David's* Conquest of *Jerusalem* in the eighth Year of his Reign, 2 *Sam.* v. 5—9. for to 515 add the 40 Years of *Moses*, and 33 Years of *David*, and 3 of *Solomon*, the whole Sum is 591 Years. The same reckoning is again confirmed from another Computation, where he (48) saies, that it was 470 Years and an half and ten Days from the building of the Temple to the Destruction of it by *Nebuchadnezzar*; and 1062 Years and a half and ten Days from the Exodus to that Time: now 592 Years, the Term from the Exodus to the building of the Temple, being added to 470 Years and a half and ten Days, the Term from the building to the burning of it; the whole Sum is exactly 1062 Years and an half and ten Days.

It is therefore evident that the different reading of the Place of *Josepbus* in the End of his vith Book of Antiquities gave occasion to the two different Rockenings of the Years from the Exodus to the Temple, the one 592 Years, as above, the other 612 Years, as it is read in other Places. For if we suppose that he reckoned *Saul* to have reigned 22 Years, as the MSS. and *Zonaras* have it, after the Death of *Samuel*; instead of two Years, as the older Readings of *Epiphanius* and *Ruffinus* had it, and which I have followed; then the whole Sum will be 612 Years from the Exodus to the Temple. But as *Josepbus* himself several times reckons it no more than 592 Years; and *Eupolemus* and the most ancient Christian Writers never give more than 20 Years to

(47) Antiq. Jud. lib. vii. c. 3. sect. 2. fin.

(48) Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 8. p. 528.

the Reign of *Saul*, I conclude that the Number 612 has been put into the Text of *Josephus* from the corrupt Reading of 22 Years instead of *two* for the Time of *Saul's* reigning after the Death of *Samuel*, and which is not at all consistent with the Scripture History of the Acts of *Saul's* Reign after the Death of *Samuel*.

Theophilus Bishop of *Antioch* read it, I think, in *Josephus*, *two* Years, and not 22 : for he agrees exactly with the Account of *Josephus*, which I have given, and saies, that *Samuel* judged *Israel* 12 Years ; and that *Saul* afterwards reigned 20 Years ; which Numbers he seems plainly to have had from *Josephus* ; and he wrote about 70 Years after *Josephus* finished his *Jewish* Antiquities.

The Supposition of *Saul* reigning no more than *two* Years after the Death of *Samuel* agrees with the Scripture Account of the Transactions, which happened between the Death of *Samuel* and *Saul*.

After the Death of *Samuel*, *David* fled from *Saul* into the Wilderness of the South of *Judæa*, not far from *Carmel* and *Maon*, 1 *Sam.* xxv. 2, 4, 5, near the *Asphaltite Lake*, or *Dead Sea* : where *Nabal* lived ; and where he had staid some Time, as appears from *ŷ* 15, 16. and whose Wife *Abigail* *David* married after the Death of *Nabal*, *ŷ* 42. So that we cannot allow less than about a Year for his Abode in this Place. After this he returned to *Ziph* ; and the *Ziphites* informed *Saul*, who who was at *Gibeah*, that *David* was in the Wilderness, and bid in the Hill of *Hachilah*, which is before *Jeshimon*, 1 *Sam.* xxvi. 1. Hither *Saul* marched with his Army of three thousand chosen Men in Pursuit of him. *David* was informed of his coming by his Spies, and surprised him in the middle of his Camp, fast asleep in the Night, and all his Guards asleep also, *ŷ* 7. and took away the Spear and Cruse of Water which were at *Saul's* Bolster, and went away, without doing him the least Harm, *ŷ* 12. After this *David* still distrusting *Saul*, notwithstanding his seeming Sorrow for having attempted the Life of him who had been so generous as to save his, when it was in his Power to have slain him in his Camp, went to *Achish* King of *Gath*, ch. xxvii. *ŷ* 2. who gave him *Ziglag* to dwell in, with his Family and Servants, *ŷ* 6. The Time of these Transactions hitherto from the Death of *Samuel* may be supposed to be not
much

much less than 2 Years; nor does it appear to be more. But then it is said, *ŷ 7. that the Time that David dwelt in the Country of the Philistines was a full Year and four Months.* This Translation, if admitted, will make the Reign of *Saul*, who was alive during this Time, to have continued *three Years* after the Death of *Samuel*. But the *Hebrew* Text has not *a full Year, or a Year of Days*, as it is represented in the Margin of our Bibles; but only, *Days and four Months*; or as it may be rendered, *Days, even four Months*: and so the *Chaldee* Paraphrase understands it. The *Alexandrian Greek* Copy reads, *Days, four Months*; and *Josephus* rendered the Words, *Days and four Months*; and saies (*Antiq. Jud. vi. c. 13.*) The Time was *four Months and twenty Days*. It is indeed true that the *Hebrew* Word *Jamim*, here used, and which properly signifies *Days*, does sometimes signify *a Year*; and the *Syriac* Version has rendered it in this Place, *Years*; and the *Arabic* Translation, *a Year*; but the *Latin Vulgate*, or *Jerome*, the *Vatican Greek* Copy, the *Complutense* and *Aldine* Copies have only *four Months*; taking the Word *Jamim*, *Days*, to be in Apposition with and explained by the Words following, *viz. four Months*, as the *Alexandrian* Copy has it: so they all understood it, *Days even four Months*, which is the true Sense. From what is observed it appears most probable that *Saul*, who was slain whilst *David* dwelt at *Ziglag*, *2 Sam. i. 1.* did not reign longer than two Years after the Death of *Samuel*, as *Josephus* and other ancient Writers inform us.

I shall only observe further on the Computation of *Josephus*, that the Difference between his reckoning and that which I have stated for the true Number, *viz. 579 Years*, is reconciled, if we deduct from his Account the 20 Years of *Samson*, which in the Text of *Judges*, *ch. xv. ŷ 20.* are expressly reckoned amongst the 40 Years of the preceding Servitude; and instead thereof add to it 8 Years to make up the whole Term of the Government of *Samuel* and the Reign of *Saul* 40 Years, as *Eusebius* and the *Paschal Chronicle* reckoned; and as the Apostle *Paul* computes them, *Acts xiii. 20, 21.* This reduces the Number of *Josephus's* 592 Years to the Sum of 580 Years.

*The Chronology of Theophilus Bishop of Antioch, in the Year of Christ
168. from his Third Book to Autolycus.*

	Years.
From the Exodus to the Death of <i>Moses</i>	40
After that, <i>Joshua</i>	27
After <i>Joshua</i> , the Servitude under the King of <i>Mesopotamia</i>	8
After that Servitude, <i>Othniel</i>	40
After <i>Othniel</i> , second Servitude under <i>Eglon</i> King of <i>Moab</i>	18
After <i>Eglon</i> , <i>Ehud</i>	80
<i>Shamgar</i> (49) omitted here after <i>Ehud</i> , but added after <i>Samson</i> and an Interregnum of 40 Years, and called there <i>Samra</i>	1
Third Servitude under the <i>Canaanites</i>	20
After this, <i>Debora</i> and <i>Barak</i>	40
Fourth Servitude under the <i>Madianites</i>	7
After this, <i>Gideon</i>	40
After <i>Gideon</i> , <i>Abimelech</i>	3
After <i>Abimelech</i> , <i>Tola</i>	22
After <i>Tola</i> , <i>Jair</i>	22
Fifth Servitude under the <i>Ammonites</i>	18
After this, <i>Jephthah</i>	6
After <i>Jephthah</i> , <i>Ibzan</i>	7
After <i>Ibzan</i> , <i>Elon</i>	10
After <i>Elon</i> , <i>Abdon</i>	8
Sixth Servitude under the <i>Philistines</i>	40
After this, <i>Samson</i>	20
After <i>Samson</i> , an Interregnum of Peace	40
Then <i>Eli</i>	20
After <i>Eli</i> , <i>Samuel</i>	12
<i>Saul</i>	20
<i>David</i>	40
<i>Solomon</i>	3
Sum total	612

(49) *Shamgar* is generally omitted, or no Years assigned to him; and *Origen* includes the Time of his Government in that of *Ehud*. Hom. iv. in lib. Jud. interpret Ruffino. And this is right.

154 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

If we deduct, as we ought, from the Sum of *Theophilus* the 20 Years of *Samson*, as being included in the preceding 40 Years of the *Philistines*; and also the 40 Years Interregnum after *Samson*, which has not the least Foundation in Scripture; and instead thereof add the 20 Years Interregnum between *Eli* and *Samuel*, which is related in Scripture, his Sum will be 572 Years: to this add 8 Years to the Sum of *Samuel* and *Saul*, the whole will be 580 Years. The Difference therefore lies in these Particulars. Hence we may correct a gross Error in the Text of *Theophilus*, lib. iii. p. 138. *Edit. Colon.* where from the *Death of Moses to the Death of David* are reckoned in one Sum no more than 498 Years, instead of 568, which is his true Number.

The Chronology of Clemens of Alexandria, in the Year of Christ 192. out of the first Book of his Stromata, p. 323—325. Edit. Parif.

	Years.
From the Exodus to the Death of <i>Moses</i>	40
After him, <i>Josbua</i>	27
After <i>Josbua</i> , first Servitude under the King of <i>Mesopotamia</i>	8
After this, <i>Othniel</i>	50
Second Servitude under the <i>Moabites</i>	18
After this, <i>Ehud</i>	80
<i>Shamgar</i> omitted	00
Third Servitude under <i>Jabin</i> King of <i>Canaan</i>	20
After this, <i>Debora</i>	40
Fourth Servitude under the <i>Medianites</i>	7
After this, <i>Gideon</i>	40
After him <i>Abimelech</i>	3
After <i>Abimelech</i> , <i>Tola</i> (whom he calls <i>Boleas</i>)	23
The next, <i>Jair</i> , is omitted, and was not in his Copy	00
Fifth Servitude under the <i>Ammonites</i>	18
After this, <i>Jephthab</i>	6
After him <i>Ibzan</i> (whom he calls <i>Abattban</i>)	7
After <i>Ibzan</i> , <i>Elon</i> (whom he calls <i>Ebron</i>)	8
After <i>Elon</i> , <i>Abdon</i> (who he calls <i>Eglom</i>)	8

But some, he saies, connected the Years of *Abattban* and *Ebron* together, or made them contemporary Judges.

The

Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews. 155

The sixth Servitude under the <i>Philistines</i>	_____	40
After this, <i>Samson</i>	_____	20
After <i>Samson</i> , he saies, there was an Anarchy, but sets down no Years, and then <i>Eli</i> the High Priest was Judge	_____	40
After <i>Eli</i> , <i>Samuel</i> with whom <i>Saul</i> reigned	_____	27
<i>David</i>	_____	40
<i>Solomon</i>	_____	3
Sum total		573

But though the Sum of *Clemens*, as reckoned above, is 573 Years, yet it is certain that he reckoned them no more than 566 Years; and so reckoned *Abatthan* and *Ebron* Contemporaries, and gave them no more than 8 Years. *Clemens* saies that his Chronology, just before stated, makes it 523 Years and 7 Months from *Joshua* to the Death of *David*; this he repeats in the same 325th Page. And the 40 Years of *Moses* and 3 of *Solomon's* Reign added, make 566 Years and 7 Months. And this also is evident from his saying a little before, that the whole Time of the Judges (*Joshua* included) to *Samuel* is 463 Years and 7 Months; and they are exactly so many by the foregoing Account. He adds to these 20 for the Reign of *Saul* after the renewing of his Kingdom, and 40 for the Reign of *David*, and so the whole Sum is as before 523, and the 40 Years of *Moses* being added with 3 of *Solomon's* Reign, the Years from the Exodus to the Temple are 566, besides the odd Months not reckoned: all which proves that this was the real Chronology of *Clemens*, for this Interval of Time, in which he agrees with the *Tyrian* Annals. This Computation also shews that *Jair* who was Judge 22 Years, was not in the *Greek* Copy which he used.

Clemens seems to be inconsistent with himself in supposing from *Ptolemy*, Priest of *Mendes* in *Egypt*, that *Moses* was as old as *Inachus* of *Argos*, and *Amosis* of *Egypt*, *Strom.* i. p. 320. and in other Places; and also makes *Solomon* to live in the Time of the *Trojan* War, which was owing to an Account which he had (and *Tatian* before him) from the *Phœnician* History of *Lætus*, and from *Menander* of *Pergamus*; who wrote, as they understood them, that

Menelaus came from *Troy* into *Phœnicia*, in the Reign of *Hiram*, Contemporary with *Solomon*; p. 326, 327, 328. *Tatian* and after him *Clemens* both misunderstood what these Historians related. Their Words as *Tatian* cites them [*Orat. cont. Græcos*] are, *That in the Reign of a certain King (not named) the Rapture of Europa happened; and that Menelaus came into Phœnicia; and Mention also was made of Hiram, who gave his Daughter in Marriage to Solomon King of the Jews. Menander of Pergamus gave the same Account.* Now it no more follows from this Narration, that *Menelaus* was contemporary with *Hiram* who reigned at the same Time with *Solomon*, than that he was contemporary with *Europa*, whose Rapture was several Centuries before the taking of *Troy*. However, though *Tatian* and *Clemens* might take Advantage of the supposed Testimonies of pagan Writers (as *Africanus*, *Eusebius*, and other ancient Christian Writers did) for carrying the Antiquity of *Moses* as high as *Inachus* or *Amphis*; though he really lived many Years after them: yet *Clemens* knew very well from Scripture the true Time of *Moses*. And his own reckoning of the Times from *Moses* to *Solomon* shews that *Moses* lived about two Centuries after *Inachus* King of *Argos*; and his reckoning also of the Reigns from *Solomon* to the Death of *Cleopatra* thirty Years before the vulgar *Æra* of *Christ*, shews that *Solomon* began to reign near 170 Years after the Destruction of *Troy*. He reckons (p. 329) from the Birth of *Moses* to the 11th of *Zedekiah* 1085 Years, six Months, and ten Days; from the 11th of *Zedekiah* to the Christian *Æra* is reckoned 587 Years; so from the Birth of *Moses* to *Christ* is 1672 Years, omitting the odd Months and Days; and deducting 80 Years for the Age of *Moses* before the Exodus, the Exodus is placed in the Year before *Christ* 1593, and this is the true Sum of that Period. Again (p. 330) *Clemens* computes from the Birth of *Moses* to the second of *Darius* Son of *Hystaspis*, 1155 Years, six Months, and ten Days: the second of *Darius* was in the Year before *Christ* 518, which is the true Year, though *Ptolemy's* Canon puts it two Years higher: these two Sums make again 1672 Years (omitting the odd Months and Days) and 80 Years of *Moses* from his Birth to the Exodus being deducted, the Exodus again is placed rightly in the Year

Year before *Christ* 1593. And farther as the foregoing Reckoning places the Reign of *Solomon* in the Year before *Christ* 1017, *Clemens* could not consistently suppose him to reign in the Time of the *Trojan* War, which he knew, and saies was 407 Years before the *Olympiads*, that is, in the Year before *Christ*, 1183, and 166 Years before the Reign of *Solomon*. It does not appear that *Clemens* ever saw the astronomical Canon of *Ptolemy*, though made at *Alexandria* before his Time: and therefore he knew not exactly the Years from *Darius* to the Christian *Æra*: but his two general Numbers before-mentioned from the Birth of *Moses* to the 11th of *Zedekiah*, and to the second Year of *Darius*, are the most accurate to be found in any Chronologer, whether ancient or modern, and very highly valuable.

THE Chronology of *Julius Africanus*, which he wrote in the Year of *Christ* 220, is the largest of all. *Syncellus* in his Chronography (p. 79.) saies, that *Africanus* having omitted the 130 Years of *Cainan*, to make them up was forced to add about 140 Years in his Chronology from the Time of *Joshua* and the Elders, to *Eli* and *Samuel*, on which Account he was blamed by *Eusebius*. And he saies (p. 175.) that the Sum of *Africanus's* reckoning, from the Exodus to the Foundation of the Temple, exceeded 740 Years. This was occasioned by making after *Samson* an Interregnum of 40 Years, and after that a Term of Peace for 30 Years more; and also giving to *Eli* and *Samuel* 90 Years. He also added 30 Years to the Elders after *Joshua*, and gave 10 Years too many to *Othniel*, all which made an Addition of 140 Years. *Eusebius* represents the Chronology of *Africanus* as follows: viz. that he assigned to *Moses* 40 Years; after this, to the Government of *Joshua*, 27 Years. (50) Then to the Elders 30 Years: then to the Judges to *Eli* 490 Years: after them to *Eli* and *Samuel* 90 Years: to these 20 Years of *Saul*, and 40 of *David*, and 4 of *Solomon* added, the whole Sum is 741 Years. The Particulars of the Numbers of *Africanus*, were

(50) In the Text of *Eusebius* it is (κῑ) 25 Years, but it should be (κζ') 27 Years; as the other Christian Writers before him, and *Eusebius* from him, has it.
Moses

	Years.
<i>Moses</i> _____	40
<i>Josbua</i> _____	27
<i>Elders after Josbua</i> _____	30
<i>Cbusan-Risbatbaim</i> _____	8
<i>Otbniel</i> (51) _____	50
<i>Eylon</i> _____	18
<i>Ebud</i> _____	80
<i>Africanus</i> mentioned <i>Sbamgar</i> , but observed that the Scripture assigned him no Years. Apud <i>Syncel.</i> p. 176. _____	
<i>Jabin</i> _____	20
<i>Debora and Barak</i> _____	40
<i>Madianites</i> _____	7
<i>Gideon</i> _____	40
<i>Abimelech</i> _____	3
<i>Tola</i> _____	23
<i>Jair</i> _____	22
<i>Ammonites</i> _____	18
<i>Jephtbab</i> _____	6
<i>Ibzan</i> _____	7
<i>Elon</i> _____	10
<i>Abdon</i> _____	8
<i>Pbilistines</i> _____	40
<i>Samson</i> _____	20
<i>Interregnum</i> _____	40
<i>Peace</i> _____	30
<i>Eli and Samuel</i> _____	90
<i>Saul</i> _____	20
<i>David</i> _____	40
<i>Solomon</i> _____	4
Sum total 741	

(51) *Eusebius* Præp. Evang. lib. x. c. 14. says the *Greek* Interpreters read the Time of *Otbniel* 50 Years: and so *Clem. Alex.* read it, and the most ancient *Alex. MS.* has the same Number. It was occasioned by the Similitude

Africanus (52) reckoned 1020 Years from the Exodus to the *Olympiads*, and so he placed it in the Year before *Christ* 1796: And also in the Reign of *Ogyges* the first King of *Attica*. To make this Number up, he placed the Return of the *Israelites* from the *Babylonian* Captivity in the 1st of *Cyrus*, about 25 Years too high; by placing it in the first Year of the Reign of *Cyrus* in *Persia*, in the first Year of the 55th *Olympiad*, and in the Year before *Christ* 560, as he reckoned, and by the Addition of a few more Years up to *Solomon*, he made *Moses* live in the Year 1796, before the Christian *Æra*. This prodigious Anachronism of above 200 Years was owing to the Hypothesis of *Moses* being contemporary with *Ogyges*, and his endeavouring to reconcile the Scripture-History to this groundless Hypothesis.

I shall postpone the Chronology of *Eusebius*, which is next in Time, and proceed to the Paschal Chronicle, which was begun by the first Compiler of it, about the Year of *Christ* 354, as the learned Editor of it, *Du Frejne*, thinks most probable.

This Chronicle reckons 632 Years between the Exodus and the Temple, *viz.*

	Years.
<i>Moses</i> ——— ——— ——— ———	40
<i>Joshua</i> ——— ——— ——— ———	27
<i>Chusan-Rishathaim</i> ——— ——— ———	8
<i>Othniel</i> ——— ——— ——— ———	32
<i>Eglon</i> ——— ——— ——— ———	18
<i>Ehud</i> , of whose Years 24 are assigned to <i>Shamgar</i> ———	80
<i>Jabin</i> ——— ——— ——— ——— ———	20
<i>Debora</i> ——— ——— ——— ———	40
<i>Madianites</i> ——— ——— ——— ———	7
<i>Gideon</i> ——— ——— ——— ———	40
<i>Abimelech</i> ——— ——— ——— ———	3
<i>Tola</i> ——— ——— ——— ———	23

of the numeral Letters N i.e. 50. and M i. e. 40. which latter is the true Number.

(52) Apud *Euseb.* Præp. Evang. lib. x. c. 10. *Synce.* Chronograph. p. 64, 65.

160 Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.

	Years.
<i>Jair</i>	22
<i>Ammonites</i>	18
<i>Jephthab</i>	6
<i>Ibzan</i>	7
<i>Elon</i>	10
<i>Abdon</i>	8
<i>Philistines</i>	40
<i>Samson</i>	20
<i>Interregnum</i>	40
<i>Eli</i>	40
<i>Samuel</i>	20
<i>Saul</i>	20
<i>David</i>	40
<i>Solomon</i>	3
Sum total	632

This Chronicle, by a peculiar Error, gives no more than 32 Years to *Othniel* instead of 40. The 8 omitted Years being added, and the 20 Years of *Samson* deducted, as being comprehended in the preceding 40 Years; and also deducting the Interregnum of 40 Years, which has no Foundation in the Scripture, the Sum will be, as it ought, 580: or the building of the Temple will commence in the 580th Year after the Exodus, which is the true Year: and which, though only 579 Years and about 7 Months, may be called 580 Years.

The Chronology of Georgius Syncellus, p. 174, etc. wrote about the Year of Christ, 792.

	Years.
<i>Moses</i>	40
<i>Joshua</i>	27
<i>Elders after Joshua</i>	18
<i>Cbusan-Riskatbaim</i>	8
<i>Othniel</i>	40
<i>Eglon</i>	18
<i>Ehud</i>	

Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews. 161

	Years
<i>Ehud</i> _____	80
<i>Shamgar</i> mentioned, but no Time assigned him, as not ruling a Year	00
<i>Jabin</i> _____	20
<i>Deborah</i> and <i>Barak</i> _____	40
<i>Madianites</i> _____	7
<i>Gideon</i> _____	40
<i>Abimelech</i> _____	3
<i>Tola</i> _____	23
<i>Jair</i> (in the Text 20, by an Error of the Copier) _____	22
<i>Ammonites</i> _____	18
<i>Jephthah</i> _____	6
<i>Ibzan</i> _____	7
<i>Elon</i> _____	10
<i>Abdon</i> _____	8
<i>Philistines</i> _____	40
<i>Samson</i> _____	20
Interregnum of Peace _____	40
<i>Eli</i> _____	20
<i>Samuel</i> _____	20
<i>Saul</i> _____	40
<i>David</i> _____	40
<i>Solomon</i> _____	4
Sum total	659

This *Syncellus* declares to be the Sum of his Chronology, p. 175: and yet he is so inconsistent as to reckon with *Africanus* 1020 Years from the Exodus to the Olympiads, p. 65. which brings the Exodus up to the Year before *Christ* 1796. whereas *Syncellus* placing the 4th of *Solomon* in the Year before *Christ* 1026, could carry the Exodus no higher than the Year before *Christ* 1685.

162 Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.

The Chronology of Eusebius Bishop of Cæsarea, wrote about the Year of Christ 330, in his *Præparatio Evangelica*, lib. x. c. 14.

	Years.
Moses	40
After him Joshua, to whom, he saies, some gave 30 Years, but he gave him no more than 27	27
First Servitude under the King of Mesopotamia	8
After that, Othniel, to whom he saies the Septuagint gave 50 Years, but the Hebrew Text, he observes, has no more than 40 Years, which he follows in his <i>Chronicon</i>	40
Eglon	18
Ehud	80
Shamgar. omitted	00
Jabin	20
Debora and Barak	40
Medianites	7
Gideon	40
Abimelech	3
Tola (in his <i>Chronicon</i> 22, but here 23)	23
Jair	22
Ammonites	18
Jephthab	6
Ibzan	7
Elon, who, he saies, in his <i>Chronicon</i> , is omitted in the Greek Text of the Septuagint, but he is mistaken; for he was in that Text, though not in his Copy	10
Labdon, or Abdon	8
Philistines	40
Samson	20
Eli (in the Greek Text of the Septuagint hath only, he saies, 20 Years; but in the Hebrew 40, which he follows)	40
Samuel and Saul, in whose Years he includes the 20 Years abode of the Ark in the House of Abinadab, 1 Sam. vii. 1, 2.	40
David	40
Solomon	3
Sum total	600

Syncellus, p. 175. tells us that this was the Computation of *Eusebius*: and it appears to be so from the Preface to his *Chronicon*, where (53) he saies the *Hebrew* Numbers of the Book of *Judges* amount to this Sum: but this Interval, he saies, was only 479 Years, according to the lesser Number of the Book of *Kings*, in which it is said to be in the 480th Year after the Exodus that *Solomon* began to build the Temple, 1 *Kings* vi. 1. and this lesser Number he follows in his *Chronicon*. If we deduct from the above-stated Number of *Eusebius*, viz. 600, 1 Year from *Tola*, and 20 Years from *Samson*, which are a part of the preceding 40 Years, as hath been frequently observed, we have the true Number as reckoned by the Book of *Judges*, which is, as before proved 579 Years, if *Tola* has 22 Years, or 580 if he has 23 Years: but I have chosen the former Number.

That which imposed upon *Eusebius*, and engaged him to follow and to put into his *Chronicon* the lesser Number of 479 Years, was a pretended ancient traditional Interpretation (which he there speaks of) amongst the *Jews* of the Numbers of the Book of *Judges*, by which they (54) included all the Years of Servitude which they reckoned to be 120 (though they are but 111) in the Years of the *Judges*: and so reduced the 600 Years of the Book of *Judges*, as *Eusebius* reckoned them to 480 or 479 Years, in order to reconcile them to that Number which was inserted into the Book of *Kings*; and which Number it is very probable was there first inserted to support this absurd traditional Interpretation. And this I take to be one of the Contrivances of the *Jews* to shorten their Chronology in Opposition to the Computations of the Christians, from the plain Sense and express Numbers of both the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Text in the Book of *Judges*.

(53) A Moyse usque ad Solomonem et primam ædificationem templi Anni computantur 479, secundum minorem tamen numerum quem tertius liber regnorum continet: nam juxta volumen Judicum supputantur anni 600. Procem. fin.

(54) λέγει ὁ (Eusebius) καὶ ἐξηγήθη ἐν τῷ νμ'. (i. e. 440.) ἔτι τ' ἐξόδα τ' αἰπ' Αἰγύπτῃ ἤρξατο οἰκοδομεῖν Σολομών τ' ναόν. πρὶν δ' Ἐβραϊκόν· ἐξηγήθη ἐν τῷ ν' καὶ α' ἔτι (i. e. 480.) ταῦτα δέ, φησιν, οἱ Ἰσραηλίων διδάσκαλοι ἀκρίτως συνάγεσθ' ἔλεγον, μείνης τ' τ' ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ κελῶν χρονογραφίας ἀριθμημένης, καὶ μὴ λογιζομένης ἰδίως τ' τ' ἀποφύλων, ἀλλὰ τ' τ' κελῶν συντομῆς. ὅπερ εἰ συνάδῃ τῇ ἱερᾷ τ' κελῶν βίβλῃ, Syncel. Chronograph. p. 175.

164 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

This fictitious Number first added by the *Jews* to the *Hebrew* Text of the Book of *Kings*, they had very nearly got inserted before the Time of *Eusebius* into some Copies of the Septuagint, which have 440 instead of the *Hebrew* Number 480; and which Number is now retained in most, if not all the *Greek* Copies; except the *Complute*.

But it is very evident from the Computations of the most ancient Scripture-Historians, and particularly *Demetrius*, who lived many Years before the Christian *Æra*, and also from the Calculation of the oldest Christian Writers, *Theophilus* Bishop of *Antioch*, *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, and *Africanus*, that they had no such Number as either 400 or 440 in the Septuagint Version, or in the *Hebrew* Text: and it is as evident from the reckoning of *Josephus* that he had no Number in his *Hebrew* Copy: and it will presently appear that *St. Paul* knew of no Number either in the *Hebrew* or *Greek* Text. Therefore this Corruption of the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Copies is not probably older than the Middle of the third Century. For *Origen* (55) cites the Text, 1 *Kings* vi. 1. in his Commentary on *St. John's* Gospel, where he mentions the Year of *Solomon's* Reign, and the Month when he began to build his Temple, but saies nothing of the Year from the Exodus, or the *Israelites* going out of *Egypt*: nor is this Year mentioned in the parallel Place of the Book of *Chronicles*, where the building of the Temple is related. And this is the more observable, because where:

(55) *Origen* cites the Text, viz. γέγραπτόν ἐστιν ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ τῶ βασιλευσίν, viz. ἡπείμασαν τὰς λίθους καὶ τὰ ξύλα τρεῖς ἔτεσιν, ἐν δὲ τῷ τελευτῶν ἔτι, μηνὶ δολέμῳ, βασιλευσίν καὶ βασιλείᾳ Σολομῶν καὶ ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ. κ. τ. λ. *They prepared Stones and Timber three Years: and in the fourth Year, in the second Month, of Solomon's Reign over Israel, etc.* Com. in Joh. p. 187. The preceding Words; and it came to pass in the 480th Year after the Children of Israel were come out of the Land of Egypt, which in the present Text intervene between the Words, *Stones and Timber three Years*, and the following Words, *and in the fourth-Year*, are all omitted in *Origen's* Citation of the Text, and were not in his Copy, either *Greek* or *Hebrew*. For had they been in either, he neither could nor would have omitted them, because they are the most remarkable Words in the Text; and more material to be observed than the Month or even the Year of the Reign in which *Solomon* began to build the Temple. We may therefore be almost sure that the Words *in the 480th Year, etc.* are an Interpolation of the Text, and were not in it when *Origen* wrote his *Commentaries*, about the Year of *Christ* 230, or at latest 235.

ever

ever the Years were added in the Books of *Samuel* and of the *Kings*, and the same Transactions are related in the *Chronicles*; the Years are always set down in the *Chronicles*, as well as in the Books of *Samuel*, and the *Kings*; and also exactly in the same Manner: only we may except that the Years of the building of the Temple, and of the King's own House, are set down in two distinct Numbers, [the first *seven* Years, the latter *thirteen* Years] 1 *Kings* vi. § 38. ch. vii. § 1. but in 2 *Chron.* ch. viii. § 1. the two Sums are added together and called *twenty Years*, as they are also called 1 *Kings* ch. ix. § 10. and the former distinct Numbers are not mentioned at all in the *Chronicles*. So that this is no real Exception to what is observed: and it is highly improbable, that so remarkable a Number of Years, as that from the Exodus to the building of the Temple, should be set down in the History of the *Kings*, and yet not be mentioned in the *Chronicles* of the same Kings, where the Time of the same building is mentioned, both the Year of *Solomon's* Reign, and the Month of the Year. And it is next to impossible to suppose, had the Number been set down, as we now find it, in the Book of *Kings*, that no ancient Writer either *Jewish* or Christian before *Eusebius*, should have found or observed it; but should always reckon the Years from the Exodus to the Temple, by the Times of the Judges and Kings to *Solomon*; whose Computations are very different from the Sum inserted in the Book of *Kings*, which Sum is utterly irreconcilable to the Numbers of the Years of the Judges.

Nothing is plainer than that the History of the Judges always clearly and expressly distinguisheth the Years of the several Servitudes of the *Jews*, from the Years of the Government of their Judges after each Deliverance from Servitude; and it is highly absurd to include the Years of Peace and Rest in the Years of War and Bondage: and all the Christian Writers (except *Eusebius*) unanimously distinguished them. And *Eusebius* himself distinguished them in his other Writings; though in his *Chronicon* he has followed the lesser corrupted Numbers of the *Jews* of his Time, for which he is very justly found Fault with by the learned Chronologers and Historians (56) *Anianus* and *Panodorus*,

(56) Apud Syncel. Chronograph. p. 36.

who

who wrote in the latter End of the fourth Century ; and by (57) *Synecellus* after them. But that the *Jews* had no ancient Tradition for interpreting the History of the Judges, so as to make the Years of Servitude a Part of the Years of the Government of the Judges, may from hence be certainly concluded, that *Josephus* all through the History of the Judges reckons the Years of Servitude distinct from those of the Government of the Judges.

And 'tis observable, though neither *Josephus* nor any of the ancient Christian Writers took Notice of it, that the twenty Years of *Samson* in which he judged *Israel*, are expressly said to have been *in the Days of the Philistines*, as being a Part of the forty Years in which the *Israelites* were subject to the *Philistines* ; that we might not think these Years distinct from, and subsequent to those of their Servitude, as the Years of all the other Judges are related to be.

Our learned Archbishop *Usher* takes another Method to make the History of the Times of the Judges agree to the supposed 480th Year from the Exodus to the Temple ; and would have the Text, where it is said that upon the Deliverance of the *Israelites* by *Othniel* (and so of the rest) that *the Land had Rest forty Years*, to mean not that the *Israelites* enjoyed a Peace of forty Years under *Othniel* ; but only that the Land began to rest in the 40th Year after the Rest which it had under (58) *Joshua*. And thus by a different Way of Interpretation he leaves uncounted all the Years of the several Servitudes, or includes them in those of the Judges. But this Interpretation is forced and unnatural ; and is, as before shewn, contrary to the unanimous Sense of the Ancients, both *Jews* and Christians : and is to be esteemed a mere Hypothesis of this great Man, void of all Foundation. Many of the most learned modern Chronologers, as *Joseph Scaliger*, and others, have followed the Scheme of *Eusebius*, not suspecting an Error in the Number of the Book of *Kings*. The learned *Petavius* also follows this Scheme with respect to some of the last Judges, though he rejects it as absurd, with regard to most of them. He reckons the 480 Years of the Book of *Kings* to commence, not from the *Israelites* go-

(57) Chronograph. p. 164, 165, 175.

(58) Chronolog. Sac. p. 203 — 213.

ing out of *Egypt*, as the Text expressly saies, but from their entering into the Land of *Canaan* forty Years after their coming out of *Egypt*. But had this been the Meaning of the Text, it would, no Doubt, have been said, *After the Children of Israel were come out of the Land of Egypt INTO THE LAND OF CANAAN*. Farther this learned Chronologer, to reconcile his Hypothesis both to the Number of the Book of *Kings*, and to St. *Paul's* reckoning of 450 Years from the Division of the Land by *Joshua* unto *Samuel*, is forced to suppose St. *Paul* to reckon not from the Division of the Land, though his Words immediately refer to it, but to reckon from the Exodus spoken of three Verses before; than which there cannot be a more absurd Interpretation. For as he admits the present Position of the Text, *Act. xiii. v. 19, 20.* it is evident that the Words of the 20th Verse, *after that he gave them Judges, &c.* must mean, *after the Completion of the forty Years in the Wilderness, v. 18.* and also, *after the Division of the Land, v. 19.* nor will his Interpretation answer his Purpose; for after all he is again forced to make St. *Paul* mean, not precisely 450 Years, but (59) only 437 Years. To such Difficulties the most learned Men are put to support a Corruption of Scripture which they do not suspect.

Having shewn from the Calculations of the most ancient *Jewish* and Christian Writers, that the Interval between the Exodus and the Temple exceeded 480 Years by an hundred Years at least; and that it is highly probable that the Foundation of the Temple was laid in the 580th Year after the Exodus; to put this important Part of Scripture-Chronology out of all reasonable Doubt, I shall produce at large the Testimony of St. *Paul*, who saies; *The God of this People of Israel, whose our Fathers, and exalted the People, when they dwelt as Strangers in the Land of Egypt, and with an high Arm brought He them out of it. And about the Time of forty Years suffered he their Manners in the Wilderness. And when he had destroyed seven Nations in the Land of Canaan he divided their Land to them by Lot: and after that he gave them Judges, by the Space of 450 Years, unto Samuel the Prophet: and afterward they desired a King; and God gave unto them Saul the Son of Cis, a Man of the Tribe of Benjamin, by the Space of forty Years, Acts xiii. v. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21.* This is the

(59) De Doctrina Temporis. lib. ix. c. 33.

plain

plain natural Construction of the Apostle's Words, and the present Order and Reading of them is supported by the *Syriac* Version, and most of the ancient Manuscripts; especially by all the Manuscripts of *Robert Stephen* with the *Complutense* and all the old Editions. And in the Words the Apostle in plain and express Terms reckons 450 Years unto *Samuel*, from the Time of the Division of the Land of *Canaan* by *Josbua* amongst the Tribes of *Israel* in the seventh Year after they came into it; and thence forty Years more to the Death of *Saul*; in all 490 Years. If we add 40 Years from the Exodus to the Death of *Moses*; and six Years from thence to the Division of the Land in the seventh Year; and 40 Years for the Reign of *David*; and three Years of *Solomon's* Reign; the whole sum from the Exodus to the Foundation of the Temple, in the fourth Year of the Reign of *Solomon*, is exactly 579 Years; and so the Temple was begun to be builded in the 580th Year after the *Israelites* came out of *Egypt*.

This Reckoning of the Apostle was the received Computation of the *Jews* in his Time, and was deduced from the History of the *Judges*; and as it is irreconcilable to the present Number of 480th Year in the Book of *Kings*, we may be assured that the Apostle knew of no such Number there. It farther appears from the above-cited Words of St. *Paul*, that the whole Term of the Government of *Samuel* as Judge, and of *Saul* as King, was exactly forty Years.

Eusebius (60) understands the 450 Years of St. *Paul* to refer to the Times of the Judges, though he himself differs from the Computation of the Apostle, which he supposes to have been *the then received Reckoning* only, but not *the true one*. *Eusebius* took his lesser Computation from later Traditions of the *Jews*, after they had altered the Chronology of the Scriptures, as I have before proved at large; and St. *Paul* followed the Scripture-History itself, and the Years set down in the Book of *Judges*: and knew nothing of the lesser Number, which was long after his Time inserted into the Book of *Kings*. *Syncellus* (61) also understands the 450 Years of the Apostle to refer to the Time of the *Judges*: nor does any other Interpretation of them appear ever to

(60) Apud Syncel. p. 175.

(61) Ibid.

have been thought of by the Ancients; nor would any other probably have been thought of by the Moderns, but only for the sake of the interpolated Number of the Book of the *Kings*, which is inconsistent with the Reckoning of the Apostle, as well as with the History of the Book of *Judges*.

Our great Chronologer Archbishop *Usher* (62) puts another Sense upon the Apostle's Words, and would have them mean; *And after these Things which were done in the Space of 450 Years*, [viz. from the Time God chose their Fathers, *ŷ* 17. to which remote Verse he refers them] *He gave them Judges*, and so on. The various Reading or Order of some Manuscripts in this Passage of Scripture, which favours Archbishop *Usher's* Sense, Dr. *Mill* rightly judges to have been made on Purpose to avoid the Difficulty of the Apostle's Calculation, and to make it consistent with the 480th Year of the Book of *Kings*. But he thinks the learned Prelate's Sense, above given, may be admitted without altering the common or received Reading and Position of the Words of the Text. But in this Dr. *Mill* is mistaken; for this Sense is neither so natural or grammatical, nor will the Calculation agree with it neither. The Apostle had spoken before of the Time which the *Israelites* spent in the Wilderness, after their coming out of *Egypt*; then he proceeds to mention their Wars with, and Conquest of, the seven Nations, and the Division of their Land amongst the Tribes by Lot; the Term of this also is related in Scripture: then he goes on in the History, as was natural, to speak of the Years of the *Judges*, after this Division unto *Samuel*, who was the last of them, and their Years also are set down in their History: and from *Samuel* he proceeds to mention the Kingly Government of the *Jews*, and tells us the Years of *Samuel's* and *Saul's* Administration, which are not recorded in Scripture, but which, from the received Tradition of the *Jews*, were, he saies, *the Space of forty Years*: and concludes his Narration with *David*, from whose Family *Christ* descended *ŷ* 23. It is therefore a very unnatural and forced Interpretation to refer the Words of the Apostle, which are immediately, and in natural Construction, applied to the Times of the Judges of the

(62) Chronol. Sac. p. 195, 196.

Israelites, to what is said three Verses before of *God's choosing their Fathers*. And if we should without Reason allow them to be connected with what is said so remotely as *ŷ* 17. yet the 450 Years bring us no higher than the Birth of *Isaac*. But God had chosen *Abraham* the first of their Fathers twenty five Years before, when he called him out of *Haran*, into the Land of *Canaan*, *Gen.* xii. *ŷ* 1, — 5. So wholly unsupported is *Usher's* Sense of the Apostle's Words. And as the Apostle's Computation of 450 Years from the Division of the Land of *Canaan* amongst the *Jews* to the Time of *Samuel's* judging *Israel*, agrees exactly to the Beginning of the building of the Temple, in the 580th Year after the Exodus; so the Message of Judge *Jephthah* to the King of the *Ammonites*, *Jud.* xi. 13—26. agrees to this Calculation. The King of the *Ammonites*, as a Pretence for making War upon the *Israelites*, tells the Messenger of *Jephthah* that the People of *Israel* had unlawfully seized upon his Country, after they came out of *Egypt*: to this Charge *Jephthah* replies by his Messengers, that *Israel's* Title to this Country could not be called in question, who at first conquered it in a lawful War, in which the King of the *Amorites*, to whom it belonged, was the Aggressor; and had been in Possession of it three hundred Years, *ŷ* 26. *Josephus* read it (63), more than three hundred Years. And it was more: for *Sidon* King of the *Amorites* was conquered in the End of the 40th Year after the Exodus, *Numb.* xxi. 24, 25. and from thence to the Time of *Jephthah's* undertaking the War against the *Ammonites* was 346 Years, which *Jephthah* might well call 300 Years, or more; and from *Jephthah* to the Temple was 194 Years; and 39 more from the Exodus to the Conquest of the *Amorites* being added, the whole from the Exodus to the Temple was 579 Years.

Sulpitius Severus (64) in his sacred History, wrote in the Beginning of the fifth Century, reckons the Interval from the Exodus to the Temple 588 Years; and observes that the *Greek* Number 440 in the Book of *Kings* must be a Corruption of the Text: and this Corrup-

(63) *Antiq. Jud.* lib. v. c. 7.

(64) Non dubito librariorum negligentia, præsertim tot jam seculis intercedentibus, veritatem fuisse corruptam, lib. i. c. 70.

tion both in the *Hebrew* Text and in the *Greek* Version has been fully proved in the foregoing Observations.

Melchior Canus (65), a learned Popish Writer and Commentator, suspected the Number 480 in the Book of *Kings*, though authorised by the *Latin* Vulgate, to be a corrupt Reading both in that Copy and in the *Hebrew* Text; and that the *Greek* Text was corrupted also. And the more learned Jesuit *Petavius* (66) owns that many great Men among the Papists have been of opinion, either that this Text of the Book of *Kings* has been corrupted, or however that the Number of it is not the true and whole Number of Years from the Exodus to the Foundation of the Temple. And he himself computes it to be 520 Years, as observed above.

One considerable Objection to the Term of 580, or more exactly 579 Years, between the Exodus and the Temple remains to be cleared; and it is this: the Scripture mentions no more than five Generations between *Naashon Prince of the Children of Judah*, *Num.* i. 7. ii. 3. and *Solomon*, viz. *Salmon* or *Salma*, *Booz*, *Obed*, *Jesse*, and *David*. *Mat.* i. 5, 6. *Luke* iii. 31, 32. *Ruth* iv. 21, 22. 1 *Chron* ii. 11, 12. This Objection, I confess, is stronger against the Term of 580 or 579 Years, than against the Sum of 480 or 479 Years. But the learned

(65) Non existimo aut fidei aut religionis quæstionem esse, *num.* 480. (1 *Reg.* vi. 1.) iste annorum numerus qui in codicibus pervulgatis reperitur, librariorum vitio scriptus sit, an potius idem ab auctore sacro in suo exemplari positus. Ostendimus enim errorem in numeris promptissimum esse atque facillimum. ostendimus numeros quosdam in libris sacris exscribentium errore vitiatos. ostendimus denique multas esse causas cur hic de quo agimus 480. annorum numerus corrupte esse inductus videatur. He concludes; Ne vero imperitus quisquam hujus loci vitium in Latinæ Editionis odium torqueat, æque sciat Græca Hebræaque Exemplaria esse corrupta. Apud Morin. Exercit. 7. lib. i. c. 4. p. 177.

(66) Magni quidam viri et quidem catholicarum partium, ne ex solis hæreticis invidiam nobis faciant; in eam sententiam partim evidentibus libri Judicum testimoniis, partim Josephi Hebræi scriptoris adstipulatione deducti sunt, ut vel corruptum a librariis numerum illum esse iii. *Reg.* dicerent: vel aliam in eo rationem initam, quam ut totum ipsum intervalli tempus ea summa complecteretur. quam in rem erudite et eleganter disputat Melchior Canus lib. xi. de locis, ubi numerum illum lib. iii. *Reg.* ab exscriptoribus immutatum videri posse pluribus argumentis demonstrat. Doct. Tempor. lib. ix. c. 33.

Usher (67) found it insuperable even against his lesser Number of 480 Years, as appears by his Way of reconciling these Generations to it.

Taking it for granted that *Salmon* married *Rabab* the Harlot or Inn-keeper, mentioned in the Book of *Joshua* to have concealed the Spies whom *Joshua* sent into *Jericho*, ch. ii. v. 1. he supposes that *Salmon* married her 42 Years after the *Israelites* came into the Land of *Canaan*, and that she was twenty Years of age when they first came thither, and so bare *Booz* when she was 62 or 63 Years of age. This, though not impossible, is yet very highly improbable. Then he supposes *Booz* to be 102 Years old at the Birth of his Son *Obed*; and *Obed* to be 111 Years old at the Birth of his Son *Jesse*; and *Jesse* as many at the Birth of *David*. The Supposition of three such Generations together is altogether incredible; and is not to be found in Scripture since the Days of *Serug*, the Great-grandfather of *Abraham*: and it is observable, that from the Birth of *Abraham* to only 470 Years after, there were nine Generations, viz. *Abraham*, *Isaac*, *Jacob*, *Judas*, *Phares*, *Efrom*, *Aram*, *Aminadab*, *Naashon*: for *Eusebius* makes *Naashon* 35 Years old at the Exodus, which was 505 Years after the Birth of *Abraham*; whereas six Generations from *Naashon* to *Solomon* made, as was supposed, 600 Years at least. *Syncellus* takes Notice of this Difficulty of reconciling the Account of six Generations from *Naashon* to *Solomon* to the great Number of Years in that Interval, which he observes were no less than 600: and asks the Question how this Number of Years was to be accounted for, making, according to this reckoning, 100 Years one Generation with another? (68) *Syncellus* offers no Solution to the Difficulty, not knowing what to say to it. But (69) *Eusebius* endeavoured to solve it by throwing all the Years of Servitude out of the Number, and reckoning no more than 479 Years from the Exodus to *Solomon's* Temple. But this lesser Number we have seen is by no means reconcileable to so few intervening Generations. There is but one Way, I think, to solve the Difficulty; and that is by supposing some Generations to have been omitted in recording this Gene-

(67) *Chronol. Sac.* p. 200, 201.

(68) *Chronograph.* p. 175.

(69) *Ibid.*

alogy. This was the Opinion of the ancient Jews. The *Chaldee Paraphrase* on *Ruth*, ch. i. and ch. iv. *ŷ* 21. ſaies that *Booz* was *Ibzan*, who judged *Israel* at the Time of the Famine, mentioned ch. i. *ŷ* 1. *Joſephus* brings him lower, and ſaies (70) that the Famine happened after the Death of *Samſon*, when *Eli* was the High Priest: ſo that *Booz* was contemporary with *Eli*; and this may probably be the Truth: and makes the ſucceeding Generations from *Booz* to *David* to be agreeable to the common Courſe of Nature in thoſe Days. If this is admitted; ſince *Salmon* lived at leaſt 400 Years before *Eli* was High Priest, he could not be the Father of *Booz*, who was contemporary with *Eli*; and there muſt have been ſome Generations either between *Naathon* and *Salmon*, or between *Salmon* and *Booz*, not mentioned in Scripture.

Theſe Generations could not be between *Naathon* and *Salmon*, if the *Rabab* he married, as mentioned by St. *Matthew*, was *Rabab* the Harlot, or Inn-keeper, mentioned in the Book of *Joſhua* at the taking of *Jericho*. But as ſhe is never mentioned in the Old Teſtament to have married *Salmon*, nor does St. *Matthew* ſtyle her, *Rabab the Harlot*, as ſhe is called where ſhe is mentioned in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, ch. xi. *ŷ* 31. we cannot be certain who ſhe was. However, I am moſt inclined to think that four or five Generations are omitted between *Salmon* and *Booz* the Father of *Obed*, and for the following Reaſons.

In the Interval of theſe five Generations after *Naathon* to the Death of *David*, there are recorded no leſs than nine or ten Generations of High Priests, from, or after *Eleazar* the Son of *Aaron*, though he outlived *Naathon* who was his Uncle, *Exod.* vi. 23. many Years. 1. *Phineas*. 2. *Abiſhua*. 3. *Bukki*. 4. *Uzzi*. 5. *Zerabiah*. 6. *Meraioth*. 7. *Amariab*. 8. *Abitub*. 9. *Zadok*. 1 *Chron.* vi. *ŷ* 4, — 8. and *ŷ* 50, 53. *Ezra* makes ten Succeſſions in this Interval: for he ſaies that *Amariab* was the Son of *Azariab* or *Ezias*, as he is called 1 *Eſd.* viii. *ŷ* 2. and that *Azariab* was the Son of *Meraioth*. *Ex.* vii. 2, — 5. Or if inſtead of thoſe after *Uzzi* of the Line of *Eleazar*, we reckon thoſe

(70) *Antiq. Jud.* lib. v. c. 9.

who

who succeeded him in the High Priesthood of the Line of *Ithamar*, there were eight Generations or rather nine; viz. after *Uzzi*, the fourth High Priest above, the 5th was *Eli*. 6. *Abiab*, the Son of *Abitub*, the Son of *Pbineas*, the Son of *Eli*. 1 *Sam.* xiv. 3. 18. *Joseph. Antiq. Jud. lib. vi. c. 6.* And his Father *Abitub* might be High Priest before him, as *Reland* thinks [*Antiq. Sac. vet. Heb. p. 161.*] 7. *Achimelech*. 8. *Abiatbar*. 1 *Sam.* xxii. § 20. Here are eight Generations besides the Vacancy between the Death of *Eli* and *Abias* his great Grandson, unless his Father *Abitub* was High Priest before him, and succeeded *Eli*: and therefore we may reckon nine Generations in this Genealogy also.

Now it is no Way probable that there should be more Years by 30 or 40 in five Generations only recorded from *Naashon* to *David*, than in nine or ten successive Descents in the Families of the High Priests, from *Eleazar* and his Brother *Ithamar* to *David*. There is no Doubt therefore to be made, but that several Generations from *Naashon* to *David*, either have not been recorded in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, or have been left out in the present Copies by some very ancient Error. Such an Omission has happened in the Descent of *Ezra* the Scribe, who is reckoned the fifth in Descent from *Zadok*, who was High Priest in the Reign of *Solomon*. For he is said to be *the Son of Seraiah, the Son of Azariah, the Son of Hilkiab, the Son of Shallum, the Son of Zadok, the Son of Abitub, the Son of Amariah, the Son of Azariah, the Son of Meraioth, &c.* *Ezr.* vii. § 1, 2, 3. 1 *Esd.* viii. § 1, 2. But the Number of Years from the Death of *Zadok* to the Birth of *Ezra* being four hundred, in four intervening Generations, would justly incline us to think, if there was no other Evidence, that some Generations are wanting in this Interval. And this is Fact, and these Generations are supplied in the Book of *Chronicles*: otherwise we should have been puzzled as much in the Genealogy of *Ezra*, as in that from *Naashon* to *David*. There were in the Genealogy of *Ezra* two *Zadoks* and all the Generations between one and the other, are omitted in the Books of *Ezra* and *Esdras*, or in both the Parts of *Ezra*; but are recorded in the Book of *Chronicles*: and are no less than *seven* Generations.

Generations. 1. *Abitub*. 2. *Amariab*. 3. *Azariab*. 4. *Jobanan*. 5. *Azariab*. 6. *Abimaaz*. 7. *Zadok*. 1 *Chron.* vi. v. 4, — 15. where we read the whole Genealogy entire. *Josephus* (71) also has it at large, and reckons more Descents. Therefore if *Salmon* was the immediate Son of *Naashon*, then *Booz*, the Father of *Obed*, was a remote Offspring; and if there were two of that Name, one the Son of *Salmon*, and the other the Father of *Obed*, the intermediate Generations might be omitted by the Negligence of an ancient Copier passing from one Name to the other. And as this was the Cause of the Omission of several Generations in the Genealogy of *Ezra*, there is no Reason why we may not conclude it to have been the same in that from *Naashon* to *David*. If to these Observations we add, as taken Notice of before, that in the fourteen Generations from *Abraham* to *David*, there are more Years in the last five from *Naashon* to *David*, than in the preceding nine from *Abraham* to *Naashon*, this is sufficient to clear the Difficulty, and to put it out of all Doubt that some Generations between *Naashon* and *David* have been omitted.

HAVING settled the *Æra* from the *Exodus* to the Temple in the fourth Year of the Reign of *Solomon*, I shall proceed in Order from that Date, to settle the Years of the Reigns of the Kings of *Judah* and *Israel* to the Destruction of the City and Temple of *Jerusalem*, by *Nabuchadnezzar* King of *Babylon*. In which Term there are some Difficulties which have never yet been cleared, either by the ancient or modern Chronologers. But in the following Chronology all seeming Inconsistencies are reconciled, and the Period is rightly fixed: and from thence to the Christian *Æra*, the Sum of Years is so well known from the *Ptolemaic* Canon and other Computations, that I need not enlarge this Work to give a particular Account of them.

(71) *Antiq. Jud.* lib. x. c. 8.

A Chronological Table of the Kings of Judah and Israel, from the Foundation of Solomon's Temple, in the fourth Year of his Reign, to the burning of the City and Temple by Nabuchadnezzar: with the Scripture-Evidences of the Years of their several Reigns.

	Reigned Years	Years of the World	Before Christ.
Solomon - - -	37	4412	1014

Kings of Judah.

Reboam - - -	17	4449	977
--------------	----	------	-----

Abia - - -	3	4466	960
------------	---	------	-----

He began to reign in the 18th Year of *Jeroboam* Son of *Nebat*, 1 *Kings* xv. 1. 2 *Chron.* xiii. 1. and his Son *Afa* began to reign in the 20th of *Jeroboam*, 1 *Kings* xv. 9. so he reigned no more than 2 Years, and a Part of a Year which the *Jewish* Annals did not set down, but reckoned a Year.

Afa - - -	41	4468	958
-----------	----	------	-----

He began to reign in the 20th Year of *Jeroboam*, 1 *Kings* xv. 9. but he died in the 41st Year of his Reign, as is expressly said 2 *Chron.* xvi. 13. But as *Abia* reigned

Kings of Israel.

	Reigned Years	Years of the World	Before Christ.
Jeroboam - - -	22	4449	977

Jeroboam died in the 22^d Year of his Reign: for *Nadab* his Son began to reign in the second Year of *Afa*, 1 *Kings* xv. 25.

Nadab - - -	2	4470	956
-------------	---	------	-----

He could not reign more than one Year and a Part, because *Baasa* who succeeded him began to reign in the 3^d Year of *Afa*, 1 *Kings* xv. 33.

Baasa - - -	24	4471	955
-------------	----	------	-----

His Reign began in the 3^d Year of *Afa*, and ended in the 26th, 1 *Kings* xv. 33. xvi. 8. So he died in the 24th Year of his Reign.

Kings of Judah.

more than two Years, I reckon the Reign of *Afa* 41 Years.

	Reigned Years	Year of the World	Before Christ.
<i>Jehosaphat</i>	- - 25	4509	917

He began to reign in the 4th Year of *Abab*, 1 *Kings* xxii. 41.

<i>Joram</i>	- - -	8	4534 892
--------------	-------	---	------------

He began to reign in the 5th of *Joram*, Son of *Abab*, 2 *Kings* viii. 16. and *Abaziah* his Son reigned in the 11th and 12th of the same *Joram*, 2 *Kings* viii. 25. and ch. ix. & 29. So *Joram* died in the 8th Year of his Reign, and *Jehosaphat* died in the 5th Year of *Joram* King of *Israel*, when *Joram* King of *Judah* began to reign. All this is right, and evident from the Numbers of the Reigns of the several Kings, and therefore the Words 2 *Kings* viii. 16. *Jehosaphat* being then King of *Judah*, viz. when his Son *Joram* began to reign, are an Interpolation; and are not in the parallel Place of the *Chronicles*, 2 *Chron.* xxi. 1, 3, 5. Neither are they in the *Syriac* Version, nor in the *Arabic* Version made from the *Greek*: nor in the *Aldine* and

Kings of Israel.

	Reigned Years	Year of the World	Before Christ.
<i>Ela</i>	- - -	2	4494 932

He began to reign in the 26th Year of *Afa*, and was killed in the 27th by *Zimri*, 1 *Kings* xvi. 8. 10. he died in the Beginning of the second Year of his Reign.

<i>Omri</i>	- - -	12	4495 931
-------------	-------	----	------------

Zimri reigned seven Days before *Omri*, 1 *Kings* xvi. 15. and *Omri* reigned from the 27th Year of *Afa* to the 38th, something more than 11 Years, 1 *Kings* xvi. 15, 29.

<i>Abab</i>	- - -	22	4506 920
-------------	-------	----	------------

He began to reign in the 38th Year of *Afa*, 1 *Kings* xvi. 20. and his Son *Abaziah* is said to begin to reign in the 17th Year of *Jehosaphat* King of *Judah*, 1 *Kings* xxii. 51. By which Account he could reign no more than 20 Years. Yet all Copies and *Josephus* agree, that *Abab* reigned 22 Years. Therefore there is a numeral Mistake as to the Beginning of his Son *Abaziah's* Reign. And it is certain that *Abab* died in the 19th if not in the Beginning of the 20th Year of *Jeho-*

Kings of Judah.

Complutense Copies of 2 Kings viii. 16. nor in *Josephus*. Had the interpolated Words been rightly rendered, the Interpolation would have appeared evident. They should have been rendered, "In the 5th Year of *Joram*, "Son of *Abab* King of *Israel*, and "of *Jebosaphat* King of *Judah*, *Joram* Son of *Jebosaphat* King of " *Judah*, began to reign." So it is in the *Hebrew* Text, the *Latin* Vulgate, and in the *Vatican Greek* Copy, and in the *Chaldee* Paraphrase. And the Words were rendered, *Jebosaphat* being then King of *Judah*, to avoid the Absurdity of making *Jebosaphat*'s Son *Joram* begin to reign in the 5th Year of his Father *Jebosaphat*. And this rendering is favoured by no Copy but the *Alexandrian*; and in this the Sentence is imperfect, but Chronologers not minding this plain Interpolation, have inferred that *Jebosaphat* made his Son *Joram* Partner with him in the Government for his four last Years, of which there is not the least Intimation in Scripture: and in Consequence, have given *Joram* but four Years after the Death of *Jebosaphat*, which is contrary to what

Kings of Israel.

Joram Son of *Jebosaphat* began to reign in the 5th Year of *Joram* Son of *Abab*: and so there were no more than six Years between the Death of *Abab*, and the first Year of *Joram* Son of *Jebosaphat*: and the same Number between his Death, and the 5th of his Son *Joram*; before whom *Joram*'s Brother *Abaziah*, is said to reign 2 Years. And just so many Years there are between the End of the 19th Year of the Reign of *Jebosaphat* who reigned 25 Years, and the Beginning of the Reign of his Son *Joram*. This is farther confirmed by the *Aldine Greek* Copy of 2 Kings i. 18. where *Joram* Son of *Abab* is said to begin to reign in the 21st Year of *Jebosaphat*; and his Brother *Abaziah* reigned not quite 2 Years before him. This shews the Error of the Number of 1 Kings xxii. 51. and that *Abab* reigned 22 Years.

	Reigned Years	Year of the World	Before Christ.
<i>Abaziah</i>	-	2	4528 898

He is said to reign two Years, 1 Kings xxii. 51. but he died in the second Year of his Reign, and did not reign quite 2 Years, as *Jor-*

Kings of Judah.

is said 2 Chron. xxi. v 1, 4. where *Joram* is mentioned as only beginning to reign after the Death of his Father *Jehosaphat*; and is said to reign 8 Years. And so say *Josephus* and all ancient Chronologers, *Theophilus* Bishop of *Antioch*, *Eusebius* in his *Chronicon*, &c. But modern Chronologers giving *Joram* King of *Judah* no more than 4 Years, have in this and other Reigns, by many feigned Assumptions of Sons into Partnership of the Government with their Fathers, strangely confounded the Years of the Kings of *Israel* to make them agree to those of the Kings of *Judah*; though they agree very well without them. See *Petav. Doct. Temp.* lib. ix. c. 55. *Usher's Annals*, *Marshall's Tables*, &c. who labour in vain to reconcile these and other Reigns, by not suspecting any Errors in the *Hebrew* Text.

	Reigned Years	Year of the World	Before Christ.
<i>Abaziah</i>	- - - 1	4541	885

Abaziah is said to be forty and two Years old, when he began to reign, 2 Chron. xxii. v 2. so the *Hebrew*, *Vulgate*, *Latin*, and Com-

Kings of Israel.

sephus tells us, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. ix. c. 2.

	Reigned Years	Year of the World	Before Christ.
<i>Joram</i>	- - 12	4530	896

He was slain by *Jehu* in the Year before *Christ* 884. There is a gross Error in the *Hebrew* and other Copies about the Year of the Beginning of the Reign of *Joram*, 2 Kings i. 17. where it is said that he reigned in his Brother's Stead, in the second Year of *Joram*, Son of *Jehosaphat*. The *Alexandrian* and *Complutense* Copies have also this Reading. But in the *Vatican* Copy it is the 18th Year of *Jehosaphat*; as the *Hebrew* and all other Copies (except the *Alexandrian* which is here defective) have it in the third Chapter and first Verse. And this is agreeable to 1 Kings xxii. 51. where his Brother *Abaziah* is said to begin his Reign in the 17th Year of *Jehosaphat*. But I think it most probable that *Joram* began to reign in the 21st Year of *Jehosaphat*, where I have placed his Reign, from the *Aldine Greek* Copy, 2 Kings i. 18. and agreeably hereto *Josephus* saies that *Jehosaphat* did not live long after the

Kings of Judah.

plutense Copies read. But this could not be true, because his Father *Joram* died in the fortieth Year of his Age, ch. xxi. v. 5, 20. 2 Kings viii. 17. The Syriac and Arabic Versions, and the *Aldine Greek* Copy have *twenty two Years old*. The *Alexandrian* and *Vatican* Copies have *twenty Years old*. But *twenty two Years old*, is undoubtedly the true Reading; and is preferred in 2 Kings ch. viii. v. 26. In the *Hebrew*, *Chaldee*, *Paraphrase*, *Latin Vulgate*, *Syriac*, and *Arabic* Versions, and in all the Copies of the *Greek* Version. So that the *Complutense* Editors seem to have weakly corrected their *Greek* Copy in 2 Chron. xxii. v. 2. by the *Hebrew* and *Latin Vulgate*, without minding the true *Hebrew* and *Vulgate* Reading of 2 Kings viii. v. 26. or the Reason of the Thing itself. *Abaziah* and *Joram* Son of *Abah* were both slain the same Day in Battle with *Jehu*, 2 Kings ix. v. 24, 25, 27. in the latter End of the 12th Year of *Joram*. In the Year before *Christ* 884.

	Reigned Years	Year of the World	Before Christ
<i>Atbaliah</i>	- - - 6	4542	884

Kings of Israel.

Defeat of the *Moabites* in which he assisted *Joram*, in the Beginning of his Reign, 2 Kings ch. iii. *Antiq. Jud.* lib. ix. c. 3. fin. This shews that *Josephus* thought *Jehosaphat* lived but a few Years after the Beginning of *Joram's* Reign. And this Reading of the *Aldine Greek* Copy, is confirmed by 2 Kings viii. 16. where *Joram* Son of *Jehosaphat* is said to begin to reign in the 5th Year of *Joram* Son of *Abah*; and therefore, *Joram* Son of *Abah* must begin to reign in the 21st Year of *Jehosaphat*, who reigned 25 Years.

	Reigned Years	Year of the World	Before Christ
<i>Jehu</i>	- - 28	4542	884

2 Kings x. v. 36. and all Copies agree in the Year, of his Reign. But *Josephus* saies he reigned no more than 27 Years, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. ix. c. 8. But he must reign 28 Years, because his Son *Jehoahaz* began to reign in the 23^d of *Joash* King of Judah.

<i>Jehoahaz</i>	- - 17	4570	856
-----------------	--------	------	-----

He began to reign in the 23^d

Kings of Judah.

Eusebius gives her seven Years, in his *Chronicon*; and in his *Præpar. Evang.* lib. x. c. 14. But she was slain in the 7th Year of her Reign, 2 *Kings* xi. v. 4. 2 *Chron.* xxiii. v. 1. *Joseph.* *Antiq. Jud.* lib. ix. c. 7.

	Reigned Years	Year of the World	Before Christ.
<i>Joash</i>	- - - 40	4548	878

2 *Kings* xii. v. 1. 2 *Chron.* xxiv. v. 1.

<i>Amasiab</i>	- - 29	4588	838
----------------	--------	------	-----

2 *Kings* xiv. v. 1, 2. 2 *Chron.* xxv. v. 1. He began to reign in the 2^d Year of *Joash* King of *Israel*, agreeably to *Jehoabaz* beginning to reign in the 23^d Year of *Joash* King of *Judah*.

<i>Uzziab</i> or <i>Azariah</i>	52	4617	809
---------------------------------	----	------	-----

He began to reign in the 15th Year of *Jeroboam* the Second, as the Numbers plainly shew. *Josephus* saies he began to reign in the 14th (Ending) of *Jeroboam*. *Antiq. Jud.* lib. ix. c. 10. Sect. 3. yet by a strange Error in Numbers, it is said, 2 *Kings* xv. v. 1.

Kings of Israel.

Year of *Joash* King of *Judah*, 2 *Kings* xiii. v. 1. as all Copies agree. So these Reigns are fixed; and *Jebu* must have reigned 28 Years: and *Josephus* is mistaken in placing his Reign in the 21st of *Joash*.

	Reigned Years	Year of the World	Before Christ.
<i>Joash</i>	- - - 16	4587	839

2 *Kings* xiii. v. 10. It is plain from what is said concerning the Reigns of *Jehoabaz* and *Amasiab*, that *Jehoabaz* reigned to the 39th Ending, or to the 40th of *Joash* King of *Judah*: and so the first of *Joash* King of *Israel*, was the 40th of *Joash* King of *Judah*. But yet it is said, 2 *Kings* xiii. v. 10. that *Joash* King of *Israel* began to reign in the 37th of *Joash* King of *Judah*, and so saies *Josephus*, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. ix. c. 8. sect. 6. But then he supposed *Jebu* to die in the 27th Year of his Reign. Therefore either *Joash* reigned with his Father *Jehoabaz* two Years, or there is an Error of two Years in the preceding Number 37. But as there is no Intimation either in Scripture, or in *Josephus* of *Joash* reigning with his Father, it is certain that the Number 37 is wrong,

Kings of Judab.

that *Azariab* Son of *Amasiab* began to reign in the 27th Year of *Jeroboam* (the second) King of *Israel*. This Error is so evident, that nothing more need be said to confute it. But it is added *v* 8. that in the 38th Year of *Azariab* King of *Judab*, *Zachariab* Son of *Jeroboam* [II^d] began to reign. And if this Number be right which is in all the Copies, there must have been an Interregnum in the Kingdom of *Israel* for eleven Years after the Death of *Jeroboam* [II^d] to to bring the first Year of his Son *Zachariab* to the 38th Year of *Azariab* or *Uzziab*. And this Interregnum is also necessary to bring the first of *Menahem*, to the 39th of *Uzziab* or *Azariab*, as it is said 2 *Kings* xv. 17. and also the first of *Pekaiab*, Son of *Menahem*, to the 50th of *Azariab* or *Uzziab*, ib. *v* 23. So that no doubt can be made of this Interregnum, though the Scripture is silent about it. Towards the latter end of his reign *Uzziab* or *Azariab* usurped the Priest's Office, and presuming to burn Incense in the Temple, was struck with a Leprosy, and forced to leave the royal Palace and to dwell in a private house without the City by himself; and his Son

Kings of Israel.

and it should be the 39th Year of *Joash* King of *Judab*: for it was in the 39th Year of *Joash* (ending) when *Jeboabaz* died. And accordingly, the accurate *Aldine Greek* Copy puts the Beginning of *Joash* King of *Israel*, not in the 37th but in the 39th Year of *Joash* King of *Judab*. And this is undoubtedly the true Year. And as *Amaziab* began to reign in the second Year of *Joash*, so he outlived him 15 Years, as is said 2 *Kings* xiv. *v* 17. 2 *Chron.* xxv. *v* 25.

	Reigned Years	Year of the World	Before Christ
<i>Jeroboam</i> [II ^d]	- 41	4603	823

He began to reign in the 15th Year of *Amasiab* King of *Judab*, 2 *Kings* xiv. *v* 23. and reigned 41 Years. So it is in all the Copies. And *Josephus Antiq. Jud.* lib. ix. c. 10. agrees that *Jeroboam* began to reign in the 15th Year of *Amasiab*. And therefore by this Account his Father *Joash* who reigned but 16 Years, could not begin to reign till the 39th of *Joash* King of *Judab*, as observed above. *Josephus* gives to the Reign of *Jeroboam* no more than 40 Years. *Antiq. Jud.* lib. ix. c. 10. The Earthquake which happened in his

Kings of Judah.

Jotham governed for him, as is related 2 *Kings* xv. 5. 2 *Chron.* xxvi. 16---21. This is the only Instance of a Son taking the Government in the Life-time of his Father that is mentioned in Scripture, and the Reason is given. *Josephus* saies that the Earthquake mentioned by the Prophets *Amos* and *Zechariah*, *Amos* i. 1. *Zechar.* xiv. 5. to have happened in the Days of *Jeroboam* and *Uzziah*, happened at the time when *Uzziah* offered to burn Incense, *Ant. Jud.* lib. ix. c. 10. But if so; *Uzziah's* offering to burn Incense, and his Leprosy must have happened many Years before his Death, and as soon as his Son *Jotham* was born, if not before, for if it happened in the last Year of *Jeroboam*, that was in the Year before *Christ* 782. And *Jotham* was born that Year; and so was incapable of taking the Government: for he succeeded his Father *Uzziah* when he was 25 Years old, 2 *Kings* xv. 33. in the Year of *Christ* 757. So that *Josephus* must be mistaken.

	Reigned Years	Year of the World	Before Christ.
<i>Jotham</i> - - -	16	4669	757

He began to reign in the second

Kings of Israel.

Reign, *Amos* i. 1. was a little before his Death, and in the Year before *Christ* 782 or 783. And *Amos* began to prophesy against him *two Years* before. After the Death of *Jeroboam* there was an Anarchy or Interregnum for 11 Years; which is not taken notice of by *Josephus* or *Eusebius*. The ancient *Jews* thought *Amos* began to prophesy in the 25th of *Uzziah*. *Jerom. Com.* in *Isai.* c. vii. p. 68.

	Reigned Years	Year of the World	Before Christ.
Interregnum.	11	4644	782

After the Interregnum *Zachariah*, Son of *Jeroboam*, reigned 6 Months.

Shallum, Son of *Jabesh*, conspired against *Zachariah*, and slew him, and reigned one Month in the 39th Year of *Uzziah* ending, 2 *Kings* xv. 8, 10, 13. This was in the

Year of the World	Before Christ.
4655	771

Menahem, Son of *Gadi*, slew *Shallum*, and reigned 10 2 *Kings* xv. 14, 17.

<i>Pekaiab</i> - - -	2	4666	760
----------------------	---	------	-----

Kings of Judah.

Year of *Pekab*, Son of *Remaliab*,
2 Kings xv. 32, 33. *2 Chron.* xxvii.
 1. *Nabum* prophesied against *Ni-*
nezeb in his Reign, *Josepb.* Antiq.
Jud. lib. ix. 11.

	Reigned Years	Year of the World	Before Christ.
<i>Abaz</i>	- - - 16	4685	741

He began to reign in the 17th
 Year (ending) of *Pekab*, Son of
Remaliab, *2 Kings* xvi. 1. *2 Chron.*
 xxviii. 1. It is said that *Abaz* was
 20 Years old when he began to
 reign, *2 Kings* xvi. 2. *2 Chron.*
 xxviii. 1. And all the Copies
 in *2 Kings* xviii. 2. *2 Chron.* xxix.
 1. agree, and *Josepbus* with them;
 that his Son *Hezekiab* was 25 Years
 old when he began to reign. And
 therefore as *Abaz*, according to all
 Copies and *Josepbus*, reigned no
 more than 16 Years, it hence fol-
 lows that *Abaz* begat his Son *He-*
zekiab when he was but 10 or at
 most 11 Years of age, supposing
Hezekiab in his 25th Year when he
 began to reign.

The *Armenian* Copy indeed, in
2 King xvi. 2. saies *Abaz* was 25
 Years old when he began to reign:
 and in the parallel History, *2 Chron.*
 xxviii. 1. the most ancient *Vatican*
Greek Copy, the *Aldine*, and the

Kings of Israel.

He began to reign in the 50th
 Year of *Azariab*, or *Uzziab*, *2 Kings*
 xv. 23. *Pekab*, Son of *Remaliab*,
 conspired against him, and slew
 him, *2 Kings* xv. 25. The *He-*
brew, and all the Versions, and
Josepbus, lib. ix. c. 11. Antiq. Jud.
 agree that *Pekaiab* reigned no
 more than 2 Years. But the *Alex-*
andrian Copy has 10 Years; and
 this *Syncellus* thinks to be the true
 Reading, *Chronograph.* p. 202.
 And the *Aldine* Copy gives him 12
 Years. But 2 Years is undoubtedly
 the true Reading; and *Africanus*
 so had it, as *Syncellus* owns, *ibid.*
 Yet *Eusebius*, in his *Chronicon*,
 gives him 10 Years. These Ad-
 ditions of 8 or 10 Years were made
 to fill up the Omission of the pre-
 ceding Interregnum.

	Reigned Years	Year of the World	Before Christ.
<i>Pekab</i>	- - - 20	4668	758

He was Son of *Remaliab*; and
 began to reign in the 52 Year of
Azariab, or *Uzziab*, *2 Kings* xv.
 27.

It hath been observed that *Za-*
chariab began to reign in the 38th
 Year of *Uzziab*; and *Menabem* in
 the 39th; and *Pekaiab* in the 50th;
 and *Pekab*, Son of *Remaliab* in the

Kings of Judah.

Syriac, and *Arabic* Versions agree that *Abaz* was 25 Years old when he began to reign. But then the *Alexandrian*, *Complutense*, and *Cantabrigian* Greek Copies; and the *Armenian* also, with the *Hebrew* and *Vulgate*, have no more than 20 Years here also. If 25 Years be the true Reading, it entirely removes the Difficulty; *Abaz* being then 15 or 16 Years old when he begat *Hezekiah*. It appears from 2 *Kings* xxii. 1. and xxiii. 36. that *Josiah* begat his Son *Jehoiakim* when he was 13 Years of age. For *Josiah* was but 39 Years old when he died: and *Jehoiakim* was 25 Years old when he succeeded to the Throne, about four Months after the Death of his Father. See a Dissertation of *Bochart* on this Passage: *Geograph. Sac.* tom. ii. p. 920, etc. *Josephus*, in his *Jewish Antiquities*, lib. ix. c. 12. saies that *Abaz* died when he was 36 Years of age, and had reigned 16 Years: and so he supposed that he begat *Hezekiah* at 10 or 11 Years of age. But this, I think, is not very probable.

	Reigned Years.	Year of the World.	Before Christ.
<i>Hezekiah</i> - --	29	4700	726

Kings of Israel.

52^d. And *Jotham* began to reign in the 2^d of *Pekah*, Son of *Remaliah*: and *Abaz* began to reign in the 17th Year of *Pekah* (ending) or in the Beginning of the 18th, as the *Syriac* and *Arabic* Versions have it, 2 *Kings* xvi. 1. all these Years are fixed: so *Pekah* died in the 4th Year of *Abaz* (beginning) and yet it is said that *Hoshea*, who succeeded *Pekah*, began to reign in the 12th of *Abaz*, 2 *Kings* xvii. 1. in which Number all the Copies agree. So that there was an Anarchy of near 9 Years between *Pekah* and *Hoshea*, during which Time *Hoshea* could not settle himself in the Kingdom. To account for these of Anarchy *Syncellus* gave 28 Years to *Pekah*, Son of *Remaliah*, instead of 20. He owns that *Africanus* and *Eusebius* in their Copies had no more than 20 Years: and that almost all Copies gave to *Pekah* no more than 18 or 20 Years. But he alledges that 28 Years were given him in one very correct Copy which came to his Hands out of the Library of *Cæsarea*, and which had been taken from a Copy corrected by *Basil* Bishop of *Cæsarea*, p. 203. and it seems as if this Reading of 28 Years had been a Correction made to solve the present Difficul-

Kings of Judah.

Chronologers generally give him no more than 28 Years; though it is evident that he reigned 29 Years. So we read in 2 *Kings* xviii. 2. and in 2 *Chron.* xxix. 1. in all Copies. And *Josephus* saies he was 54 Years old when he died, and had reigned 29 Years. He began to reign in the fourth Year of *Hoshea*, as *Josephus* relates, Ant. Jud. lib. ix. c. 13. For *Hoshea* began to reign in the 12th of *Abaz* (ending) and *Abaz* dying in his 16th Year, his Son *Hezekiah* must begin to reign in the 4th of *Hoshea*: and this appears from 2 *Kings* xviii. 9. where the 4th of *Hezekiah* is expressly called the 7th of *Hoshea*, when *Sbalmaneser* King of *Assyria* laid siege to *Samaria*. And so it is in *Josephus*, Antiq. Jud. lib. ix. c. 14.

	Reigned Years.	Years of the World	Before Christ.
<i>Manasses</i>	- - 55	4729	697

2 *Kings* xxi. 1. 2 *Chron.* xxxiii. 1.

<i>Amon</i>	- - - 2	4784	642
-------------	---------	------	-----

2 *Kings* xxi. 19. 2 *Chron.* xxxiii. 21. All the Copies and *Josephus*, Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 4. agree that *Amon* reigned no more than two

Kings of Israel.

ty of the Beginning of the Reign of *Hoshea*; and to fill up the Years of the Anarchy or Interregnum. *Josephus*, Antiq. Jud. lib. ix. c. 11. gives *Pekah* 20 Years, agreeably to the Hebrew Text and all the Versions without Variation: and yet he supposes that he reigned 28 Years and more; and placeth his Death about the same Time with that of *Abaz*, lib. ix. c. 13. This was owing to his not observing the Anarchy of 9 Years which followed upon the Death of *Pekah*, who was slain by *Hoshea* 19 Years after the Beginning of the Reign of *Jotham*, 2 *Kings* xv. 30. where it is called the 20th Year of *Jotham*; that is not of his Reign (for he reigned but 16 Years, as all Copies agree) but the 20th from the Time or Beginning of his Reign: and it should have been rendered, in the 20th Year FROM *Jotham*, the Son of *Uzziah*. So the Hebrew (ל) *Lamed* before a Noun properly signifies. See *Nold. Concordant. Heb. Partic.* p. 396. And so he was slain in the 4th of *Abaz*, which was the 20th from the Beginning of the Reign of *Jotham*. *Eusebius*, by omitting the Interregnum, has carried the Beginning of *Hezekiah* several Years beyond the Captivity

Kings of Judah.

Years: excepting that the *Alexandrian* Copy gives him 12 Years, in 2 *Kings* xxi. 19. but the same Copy in 2 *Chron.* xxxiii. 21. gives him only two Years. And this undoubtedly is the true Number. Yet *Eusebius*, in his *Chronicon*, gives him 12 Years from some Copy of the *Greek* Version of the *Septuagint*: though from a better Copy he gives him no more than two Years, in his *Præp. Evang.* lib. x. p. 503. wrote after his *Chronicon*. *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, from the *Septuagint*, gives *Amon* no more than two Years, *Strom.* i. p. 328. And *Theophilus* Bishop of *Antioch* gives the same Number of Years to his reign. *Ad Autolyc.* lib. iii. Yet *Eusebius* did not feign the Number of 12 Years without any Copy to support it, as the learned *Joseph Scaliger* supposes. *Animadvers. in Num. Chron.* 1360. But *Eusebius* seems to have put down this Number from an erroneous Copy, to favour his own Hypothesis; and towards making up the Loss of ten Years and more, which he had incurred before; and to bring the second Year of *Darius*, Son of *Hystaspes* in which a Decree was granted for finishing the building of the Temple, to the 65th Olympiad, in which he placed it.

Kings of Israel.

of *Hoshea*: though he began to reign in the third Year of the Reign of *Hoshea*, 2 *Kings* xviii. 1. or rather the fourth, as *Josephus* saies, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. ix. c. 13.

	Reigned Years.	Year of the World	Before Christ.
Anarchy	- - - 9	4688	738
<i>Hoshea</i>	- - - 9	4697	729

In the ninth Year of *Hoshea* and the sixth of *Hezekiah* King of *Judah*, in the Year before *Christ* 721. *Samaria*, the Capital of the *Israelitish* Kingdom, was taken, after a Siege of three Years, by *Shalmanezzer* King of *Affyria*: and *Hoshea* and his People were made Captives, and an end was put to the Kingdom of *Israel*, after it had stood 256 Years, 2 *Kings* xvii. 6. xviii. 9, 10, 11. *Josephus* reckons this Term no more than 240 Years, 7 Months, and 7 Days. *Antiq. Jud.* lib. ix. c. 14. but he omitted the 11 Years Interregnum which followed the Reign of *Jeroboam* the second: and he gave one Year too little to the Reigns of *Abaziah*, *Jehu*, and *Jeroboam* the second. These being added make 254 Years. So there is but a Difference of two Years (the odd Months and Days not being reckoned) and this Dif-

188 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

ference was occasioned by his reckoning two Years too little for the Reign of *Pekab*, and the Interregnum which followed it. See the Note on the Reign of *Pekab*, Son of *Remaliab*.

Kings of Judah.

	<i>Reigned Years.</i>	<i>Years of the World.</i>	<i>Before Christ</i>
<i>Josiah</i>	31	4786	640

His Reign is 31 Years in all the Copies 2 *Kings* xxii. 1. 2 *Chron.* xxxiv. 1. And *Josephus*, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. x. c. 5. and *Eusebius*, *Præp. Evang.* lib. x. c. 14. yet in his *Chronicon* he has given to his Reign 32 Years: and so has *Jerome* from his Comment. in *Ezek.* iv. p. 720. though yet in his Version he has but 31 Years in 2 *Kings* xxii. 1. and 2 *Chron.* xxxiv. 1. *Josiah* was slain in Battle at *Megiddo* by *Pharaoh Necho* King of *Egypt*, 2 *Kings* xxiii. 29. in the Year (72) before *Christ* 608.

<i>Jeboabaz</i>	3 Months	4818	608
-----------------	----------	------	-----

2 *Kings* xxiii. 31. 2 *Chron.* xxxvi. 2. He was made King by the Election of the People before his elder Brother *Eliakim*: but after he had reigned *three Months*, *Pharaoh Necho* dethroned him, and made *Eliakim*, his elder Brother, King, and changed his Name to *Jeboiakim*, 2 *Kings* xxiii. 31—34. 2 *Chron.* xxxvi. 3, 4.

<i>Jeboiakim</i> , Son of <i>Josiah</i> ,	11	4818	608
---	----	------	-----

2 *Kings* xxiii. 36. 2 *Chron.* xxxvi. 5. The Reign of *Jeboiakim* is fixed to the Year before *Christ* 608, by the *Ptolemaic Canon* and Scripture. The Canon placeth the *Tboth*, or Beginning of the first Year of *Nabuchadnezzar* King of *Babylon*, in the Year before *Christ* 604. And the Prophet *Jeremiah* tells us, that *the fourth Year of Jeboiakim was the first Year of Nabuchadnezzar*, ch. xxv. v. 1. *Jeboiakim* began to reign in the Summer, about the Month of *July*, in the Year before *Christ* 608; so his 4th Year ended in *July* 604, and the *Tboth* of *Nabuchadnezzar's* Reign commenced in the Beginning of the Year 604, on the 21st Day of *January*; and so in the 4th

(72) *Josiah* was slain in the Spring, or Beginning of the Year before *Christ* 608, when *Pharaoh Necho* was in his March with his Army out of *Egypt* against the King of *Assyria*, to the River *Euphrates*, 2 *Kings* xxiii. 29.

of

Kings of Judah.

of *Jeboiakim*. And this also appears from 2 *Kings* xxiv. 12. where the first of *Jeboiachin* after the Death of his Father *Jeboiakim*, who reigned 11 Years, is said to be the 8th Year of the Reign of *Nabuchadnezzar*. And *Josephus* placeth the first Year of *Nabuchadnezzar* in the 4th of *Jeboiakim*, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. x. c. 6. So that the Æra of the Death of *Josiah* is fixed with Certainty to the Year before *Christ* 608. And *Usher*, *Petavius*, and other learned Chronologers who have followed them, in placing the Death of *Josiah* in the Year before *Christ* 610, or a Year or two higher, with *Eusebius*, have erred two Years or more: and made the Beginning of the Reign of *Jeboiakim* utterly inconsistent with the Computation of the *Ptolemaic Canon*.

	Reigned Years.	Year of the World.	Before Christ.
<i>Jeboiachin</i> reigned 3 Months and 10 Days.		4829	597

2 *Chron.* xxxvi. 2. 1 *Esdras* i. 44. *Josephus*, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. x. c. 6. fin. But in 2 *Chron.* xxxvi. 9. he is said to be no more than eight Years old when he began to reign, which is a manifest Error in the *Hebrew Copy*; and also in the *Vatican*, which has the same Number: but the *Alexandrine* and *Aldine* Copies have eighteen Years, and the *Syriac* and *Arabic* Versions have the same Number. And this Number is confirmed by the Reading of 2 *Kings* xxiv. 8. where all the Copies agree that *Jeboiachin* was eighteen Years old when he began to reign: and he is mentioned to have *Wives*, ♀ 15. which makes it certain that the Number *eighteen* is the true Number.

<i>Zedekiah</i> , Uncle of <i>Jeboiachin</i> ,	11		4829		597
--	----	--	------	--	-----

2 *Kings* xxiv. 18. *Jeremiah* lii. i. He reigned to the 19th Year of *Nabuchadnezzar*, 2 *Kings* xxv. 8. which was the 11th of *Zedekiah* ending: and the Year before *Christ* 586. On the ninth Day of the fourth Month (*June*) the City of *Jerusalem*, after a Siege of 18 Months, was taken by the Army of the King of *Babylon*, which was commanded by five of his Generals, called *Nergal-Sharezer*, *Samgar-Nebo*, *Sarsechim*, *Rab-Saris*, and *Nergal-Sharezer* the *Rab-mag* or Prince of the *Magi*, *Zedekiah*, with his Army, fled by Night out of the City; but

but the *Chaldeans* pursued after them, and took *Zedekiah* in the Plains of *Jericho*, and carried him and his Sons to *Nabuchadnezzar*, who lay at *Riblah* in *Syria*; where the King of *Babylon* first upbraided him with his Perfidiousness and Ingratitude in rebelling against him; and then ordered his Sons to be slain before his Eyes: and afterwards commanded his Eyes to be put out; and carried him bound with Chains to *Babylon*, and imprisoned him there for Life, *Jeremiah* xxxix. 2—7. lii. 4—11. 2 *Kings* xxv. 2—7. About a Month after, on the tenth Day of the fifth Month (*July*) *Nabuchadnezzar* sent *Nabuzaradan*, Captain of his Guard, to *Jerusalem*, utterly to lay it waste. He, by the King's Command, burnt the Temple and the Royal Palace, and all the Houses of *Jerusalem*; and his Army brake down the Walls all round it, and laid the whole City in Ashes and Ruins. They also took every thing that was valuable out of the Temple and City; and carried away captive all the People that remained, leaving only the poorer sort to be Vine-dressers, and to till the Land, *Jeremiah* lii. 12, etc. xxxix. 8, 9, 10. 2 *Kings* xxv. 8—18. In the latter of which Places, 2 *Kings* xxv. 8. the Copies vary. For in the *Hebrew*, *Greek*, *Vulgate*, and *Chaldee* Paraphrase *Nabuzaradan* is said to have come to *Jerusalem* on the seventh Day of the fifth Month; and in the *Syriac* and *Arabic* Versions it is the ninth Day of the fifth Month. But as all the Copies in *Jeremiah* lii. 12. agree that it was the tenth Day of the fifth Month: the burning of the City and Temple is to be fixed to this Day. Now the *Davidic* Race of Kings, twenty-one in Number, ended. *Josephus* reckons the Term of their Reigns including the 20 Years of the Reign of *Saul*, to be 514 Years, 6 Months, and 10 Days. These he computed in the following Manner: 20 Years of *Saul*; 40 of *David*; 80 of *Solomon*; from *Rehoboam* to the Captivity of *Hoshea* in the 6th Year of *Hezekiah*, he reckoned 240 Years, 7 Months, and 7 Days; from thence to the Captivity of *Zedekiah* he computed 134 Years wanting 27 Days; these 27 Days reckoned a Month, the Sum is 514 Years, 6 Months, and 10 Days.

The chief Error in this Reckoning of *Josephus* is his giving 80 Years to the Reign of *Solomon*, as he undoubtedly did, instead of 40 Years; which is the true Number, in which all the Copies of the Scripture agree; and all the ancient Writers both before and after *Josephus*: and
it

it does not appear that *Josephus* had any Evidence for his larger Number. And this Metachronism of 40 Years is the more unaccountable, because *Josephus*, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. viii. c. xiii. sect. 12. fin. p. 458. saies *Menander* made mention, in his *Tyrian Annals*, of the great Drought recorded in *Ahab's* Reign, to have happened in the Reign of *Itbopal*, or *Eth-Baal*, 1 *Kings* xvi. 31. whose Daughter *Jezebel Ahab* married. Now *Itbopal*, called by the *Greeks Itbotalus*, could not be contemporary with *Ahab*, or reign at the same Time with him, if *Solomon* reigned 80 Years: but must, by *Josephus's* own Account, be dead many Years before the Reign of *Ahab*: and yet he saies he was (73) contemporary with *Ahab*. *Josephus* also, in his first Book against *Apion*, p. 449. saies that the Temple of *Solomon* was built in the 12th Year of *Hiram* King of *Tyre*, who reigned 34 Years, [rather 53.] p. 448. [See the *Tyrian Annals* at the End.] So from the Temple in the fourth of *Solomon* to the End of *Hiram's* Reign, was 23 Years. The next King *Baleazar*, or *Balbazar*, reigned seven Years. The next, *Abdastartus*, reigned 9 Years. The next, one of his Nurse's Sons, reigned 12 Years. The next, *Astartus*, reigned 12 Years. The next, *Ascrymus*, reigned 9 Years. The next, *Pheles*, reigned 8 Months. Then *Itbotalus*, or *Eth-baal* reigned 32 Years. So all the Years from the 12th of *Hiram* and 4th of *Solomon*, to the Death of *Itbotalus*, were 104, and 8 Months. And from the same Æra (if *Solomon* reigned no more than 40 Years,) to *Ahab's* Reign, are 94 Years.. And therefore *Itbotalus*, by this Ac-

(73) Κατὰ τῶτον [Ἀχαεὶν] ἡ 16^η ἔαλθ' ἐβασίλευσε Τυρίων. *Antiq. Jud.* lib. viii. c. 13. This *Itbobaal* or *Eth-Baal*, is called King of the *Sidonians*, 1 *Kings* xvi. 31. because the *Sidonians* were subject to the Kings of *Tyre*, see 1 *Kings* v. 6. though afterwards they had Kings of their own: as appears from *Jerem.* xxv. 22. and xxvii. 3. It is probable that the *Sidonians* had Kings of their own from the Year before *Christ* 721, when they revolted from *Eluleus* King of *Tyre*; and put themselves under the Protection of *Salmanassar*, King of *Assyria*, when he invaded *Syria* and *Phœnicia*, and attempted the Conquest of *Tyre*. *Menander*, who translated the *Tyrian* Records out of the *Phœnician* Language into *Greek*, related that in this War of the *Assyrians* with the *Tyrians*, *Sidon* revolted from the *Tyrians*, and surrendered to the King of *Assyria*. *Jos. Antiq. Jud.* lib. ix. c. 14. After this we meet with Kings of the *Sidonians* under the *Babylonian* and *Persian* Empire; and afterwards under the Empire of the *Greeks*, to all which they were subject.

count,

count, reigned above ten Years with *Abab*; agreeably to the *Tyrian Annals*. But if *Solomon* reigned 80 Years, then from the *Æra* of the Temple it will be 134 Years to the Reign of *Abab*; and by this Reckoning *Itbobalus* was dead about 30 Years before the Reign of *Abab*: and so he must be, and more Years, according to *Josephus's* own Reckoning of 163 Years between the Reign of *Solomon* and Death of *Abab*; *Antiq. Jud. lib. viii.* The other Error of 240 Years, 7 Months, and 7 Days, instead of 256 Years, &c. I have noted above, under the Reign of *Hoshea*.

In another Place *Josephus* reckons from the first building of *Jerusalem* by *Melchisedec* [which City was called *Solyma* before by the *Canaanites*] to the Destruction of it by *Nabuchadnezzar*, 1468 Years, and six Months, *De Bell. Jud. lib. vi. c. 10.* And as this Destruction happened in the Year before *Christ* 586, the whole Term from its building by *Melchisedec* to the vulgar *Æra* of *Christ*, by his Reckoning, is 2054 Years, (omitting the odd Months) from which Sum we must deduct 40 Years out of his 80 Years Reign of *Solomon*, and then it will be 2014 Years. And it appears from the Scripture-History and Chronology truly stated, that *Melchisedec* was King of *Salem* at this Time, *Gen. xiv. 18.* And it is probable that he built or enlarged *Solyma* or *Salem*, about the Time that he met *Abraham* upon his Return from the Defeat of the four confederate Kings, which happened about the Year before *Christ* 2018. This entirely agrees to the *Greek* Chronology of Scripture: and shews also that the *Hebrew* Chronology which *Josephus* followed, was the same with that of the *Greek* Version, before it was corrupted by the *Jews*.

Josephus also is very precise in his Computation from the building of the Temple to the burning of it, which he makes 470 Years, six Months, and ten Days, *Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 8. p. 528.* Now deducting 40 Years, as we always must, from his Accounts wherein the Reign of *Solomon* is included, to which he gives 80, instead of 40 Years, the Sum (without regarding the odd six Months and ten Days) will be 430 Years: and by my Computation above taken from the Series of the Reigns of the Kings of *Judah*, it is 428 Years. Our learned modern Chronologers, *Usher*, *Lloyd*, *Petavius*, make this Term no more than

424 Years, by a Metachronism of *four* Years. The most learned *Joseph Scaliger* computes it to be 427 Years, differing only one Year from my Reckoning. *Canon. Isagog.* lib. iii. p. 289.

Whoever will examine the Series of the Kings of *Judah* and *Israel*, in the Chronicon of *Eusebius*, in *Petavius*, the Annals of Archbishop *Usher*, *Ludovicus Capellus*, *Jacobus Capellus*, *Vossius*, Sir *John Marsham*, the Chronological Tables of Bishop *Llboyd*, and others, with the plain Scripture Account, will find in their Management, great Confusion and Inconsistency with the History of Scripture.

They did not consider that the *Jews* never reckoned any odd Months, which were over and above the Years of the Reigns of their Kings; and therefore often ascribe the whole Year in which they died to their Reign, though they lived but a Part of it; and yet they reckoned the Years of the succeeding King from the Death of the preceding: and sometimes also the entire Years of Reigns were only reckoned, though the Kings lived some Months more. This is plain and easy to be observed by the Correspondency of the Years of the Reigns of the several Kings of *Judah* and *Israel* with one another, as noted in Scripture, which is the true Key, and gives great Light to the true Times of those Reigns. There are also two or three numeral Errors in the present Copies, relating to the Years of Correspondency of some of the collateral Reigns, which have not been attended to. To solve the Difficulties arising from these which I have noted and removed all along, the modern Chronologers above-mentioned, have been forced to make Hypotheses; and to feign that several Kings took their Sons or Successors into Partnership of the Government for a Part of their Reign; and so have shortned the Reigns of some Kings; and have also made two Beginnings of their Reigns, without any Ground or Evidence from Scripture; and in Contradiction to the plain History of it. But I have shewn that the Chronology of the Reigns of the Kings of *Judah* and *Israel* is easy and consistent without any feigned Assumptions: and that two or three numeral Errors being corrected by comparing several Copies, and one Part of Scripture with another, and also with *Josephus*, who affords great Light to the Scrip-

ture-History in many Things, the correspondent Years of the Reign of the Kings of *Judah* and *Israel*, are found to be consistent, and perfectly agreeing.

Thus I have considered the Scripture-Chronology for a Period of 4840 Years, from the Creation of the World to the Destruction of the City and Temple of *Jerusalem* by *Nebuchadnezzar* King of *Babylon*. I have distinctly examined the several remarkable *Æras* of which this great Period consists, viz. the *Æra* from the Creation to the universal Deluge: after that, the *Æra* from the Flood to the Dispersion of the Descendants of *Noah* for their peopling of the several Countries of the Earth, and to the Birth of *Abraham*. After that, I have given the Genealogy of the Patriarchs to *Moses*; and after that, I have settled the famous *Æra* from the Exodus to the Foundation of *Salomon's* Temple: and lastly, the *Æra* from the Foundation to the Destruction of it.

I have, without forming any Hypothesis, and by following the plain and simple History of Scripture only, recovered and fixed the genuine Years of this long Period, and have drawn them from the original uncorrupted *Hebrew* Text by Means of the *Greek* Version of the Septuagint which has preserved them; and also from the most ancient Writers, Pagan, Jewish, and Christian, who lived before and after the Christian *Æra*. I have carefully considered, and fully cleared up all the Difficulties with which the several Epochs of this grand Period have been more or less embarrassed; and which have hitherto been too hard for all the Labour of the most learned Chronologers, both ancient and modern, to surmount and remove, as I have observed in the Course of this Work. Erring a few Years in some of the before-mentioned *Æras*, may be impossible to be avoided; because Chronology cannot be brought to astronomical or absolute Certainty. But as I know of no Errors in the preceding Computations, and shall be glad to be informed of any, by any learned Person; so I think it is of the greatest Importance to have, of all other, the Scripture-Chronology fixed with all the Certainty it is capable of: because, as the Scripture-Antiquities and History are both the highest in Time, and by far the most authentic and best attested of any extant in the whole World; so by them the Antiquities and Chronology of all other Nations are to be tryed and proved.

And

I am persuaded that it will appear in the following Parts of this Work, that the most ancient and genuine Accounts which remain of the Origin and Antiquities of other, the oldest, most learned, and famous Nations, will be found consistent with those of the *Jews* related in their Scriptures: and by their Agreement and Concurrence (as far as can reasonably be expected in such a Length of Time, and amidst the Loss of the most ancient Records) confirm the Truth of the *Mosaic* History, and of other Parts of the sacred Writings.

In this Work, I assure my Reader, I shall make no Hypotheses for the reconciling sacred and profane, or pagan History and Chronology together: but shall follow only as well as I am able, the Evidence of the most ancient and best Authors; and by carefully examining and comparing all their Evidence together, strike out what Light I can to discover the Truth.

After the Scripture-Antiquities and Chronology, the *Chaldean* come properly under Consideration; not only on Account of the higher Antiquity of that than of any other Nation: but also as the History of it has a great Connection with that of the *Jews*.

O F T H E

BABYLONIAN or CHALDÆAN

Antiquities and Chronology.

THE principal Author of the *Chaldean* or *Babylonian* Antiquities and Chronology was *Berosus*, a *Chaldean* (1) by Birth, and a Priest (2) of *Belus* at *Babylon*. He lived, as he himself said, in the Time of *Alexander the Great*; and wrote the *Chaldean* and *Babylonian* History in three Books, which he dedicated to *Antiochus* called *Soter*, the third King after *Alexander*, about the Year before *Christ* 268. and about ten Years before *Manetbo* wrote the *Egyptian* Dynasties. He (3) collected his History from Annals of the highest Antiquity, which were kept with great Care at *Babylon* in the Temple of *Belus*; and also from the most ancient Histories. *Josephus* (4) saies that

(1) Βηρωσὸς ἀνὴρ Χαλδαῖος μὲν τὸ γένος, etc. *Joseph. cont. Apion. lib. i. § 19. p. 450. Edit. Havercamp.*

(2) Βηρωσὸς ἀνὴρ Βαβυλωνίος ἱερός δὲ παρ' αὐτοῖς Βήλης καὶ Ἀλέξανδρον γενομένης, Ἀντίοχῳ τῷ μὲν αὐτὸν τρίτῳ τῶν Χαλδαίων ἱστορίαν ἐν τρισὶ βιβλίοις καὶ ἀνέγραψε. Tatian. *Orat. cont. Græc.* Eusebius, by mistake, cites it, μετὰ Σέλευκον τρίτῳ. *Præp. Evang. lib. x. c. 11. p. 493.* Βηρωσὸς ἀκμάσας καὶ τὰς χεῖρας Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ Μακεδόνει, ὡς φησιν. *Syncel. Chronograph. p. 14. Alex. Polyhist. apud Syncel. p. 28. Euseb. Chron. Gr. p. 5.*

(3) ὅτι ὁ Βηρωσὸς τὰς ἀρχαιοτάτας ἐκκαλεσθῶν ἀναρχεφάς, etc. *Jos. ubi sup.* Ἀναρχεφάς πολεῖν ἐν Βαβυλῶνι φυλάσσειν (φησὶ Βηρωσὸς) μετὰ πολλῆς ὑπαιμελείας, etc. *Alex. Polyhist. ubi sup.*

(4) *Cont Apion, lib. i. 450.* And *Josephus* there observes that the *Babylonians* and *Chaldeans* had the Memoirs and History of their Nation from the remotest Antiquity, wrote in public Annals with the utmost Care by their learned Priests. *Ibid. § 2, 6.*

his Accounts from the most ancient *Chaldean* Records agreed with the Writings of *Moses* in the Relation of the Destruction of Mankind by a Flood; and of some being saved in an Ark; and of their Descendants, whose Times he enumerated. And *Berosus* was of so great Esteem among the *Greeks*, for his Knowledge in Astrology, that the (5) *Athenians* set up in their public School a Statue for him with a golden Tongue.

There is nothing remaining of his *Chaldean* History but a few Fragments, cited by *Josephus*, *Alexander Polyhistor*, *Abydenus*, and *Julius Africanus*. His History began at the Creation of the World; and the first Part of it contained an Account of the Origin of Things and of the first Ages of Mankind: and the second Book began with a Dynasty of ten Kings who reigned in *Chaldæa* before the Flood.

There is no doubt but that the *Chaldeans* being the most ancient Kingdom, and having many of the Patriarchs, the Descendants of *Sem* and *Ham*, born and living amongst them, had the best Opportunities of being acquainted with the oldest Account of the World, and History of the first Ages of Men. *Babylonia* was the first Place whither the Descendants of *Noah* after the Flood resorted to settle; and as many of them staid there after the Dispersion, and erected a Kingdom at *Babylon*, we may well suppose that they left there Traditions and Records, not only concerning the Flood, in which their Ancestors had been miraculously saved, but also Accounts of the Ages before the Flood, and of the Creation of the World.

These at first were delivered as we find them related in Scripture; but when Idolatry prevailed, as it did a few Ages after the Flood, the original authentic Accounts were by Degrees mixed with Fables. Yet we find that to the Time of *Berosus* a very valuable Part of the History of Mankind from the Beginning was preserved in the *Babylonian* Annals; wherein was recorded a Tradition and Series of ten Reigns of Kings before the Flood, with the Years of their Reigns; and also ten

(5) *Astrologia Berosus*, cui ob divinas prædictiones Athenienses publice in Gymnasio statuam inaurata lingua statuere. *Plin. Nat. Hist. lib. vii. c. 37.* *Berosus* was an Author of the greatest Credit; and as such is cited by many of the ancient Writers besides those before-mentioned: by *Pliny*, *Tatian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Tertullian*, *Vitruvius*, and *Eusebius*.

Ages or Generations of Men after the Flood to *Abraham*, very agreeably to the History of *Moses* in the Scriptures.

Table of the Chaldean Kings before the Flood, from Berofus, according to Africanus, who flourished in the Year of Christ 220. In the Chronography of Syncellus, p. 18.

1. *Alorus* reigned 10 Sari, or 100 Years; in the Year of the World 1073, before the Flood 1183 Years, and before the Christian Æra 4353 Years.
2. *Alasparus* reigned 3 Sari, or 30 Years; in the Year of the World 1173, before the Flood 1083 Years, and before *Christ* 4253 Years.
3. *Amelon* reigned 13 Sari, or 130 Years; in the Year of the World 1203, before the Flood 1053 Years, and before *Christ* 4223 Years.
4. *Amenon* reigned 12 Sari, or 120 Years; in the Year of the World 1333, before the Flood 923 Years, and before *Christ* 4093 Years.
5. *Metalarus* reigned 18 Sari, or 180 Years; in the Year of the World 1453, before the Flood 803, and before *Christ* 3973 Years.
6. *Daonus* reigned 10 Sari, or 100 Years; in the Year of the World 1633, before the Flood 623, and before *Christ* 3793 Years.
7. *Euedorachus* reigned 18 Sari, or 180 Years; in the Year of the World 1733, before the Flood 523 Years, and before *Christ* 3693.
8. *Amphis* reigned 10 Sari, or 100 Years; in the Year of the World 1913, before the Flood 343 Years, and before *Christ* 3513 Years.
9. *Otiartes* reigned 8 Sari, or 80 Years; in the Year of the World 2013, before the Flood 243, and before *Christ* 3413 Years.
10. *Xisuthrus* reigned 18 Sari, or 180 Years; in the Year of the World 2093, before the Flood 163 Years, and before *Christ* 3333.

(6) Εὐσεβίου καὶ Ἰωσήπου καὶ ἄλλοι παρὰ τὸν Χαλδαίων βασιλείας ἰσομετροὶ φαίνονται λέγοντες, ὅτι πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμῆος βασιλεύον, ἐπόμενοι Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ πελυϊσῶρι, καὶ Ἀβυδῶν καὶ Ἀπολλοδώρῳ. Apud Syncel. Chron. p. 36.

In

In the foregoing Computation the ten Reigns of the antediluvian *Chaldæan* Kings made 120 Sari of Years, or 1200 old *Chaldæan* Years, of 360 Days each Year. These reduced to solar tropical Years, each consisting of 365 Days and about one quarter of a Day, make a little more than 1183 Years: and these reckoned from the Year of the World 1073, when the first King began to reign, they ended in the Year of the World 2256, when the universal Deluge commenced, and at which time they ended according to *Berosus* as will be shewn.

Tables of the Chaldæan Kings before the Flood, from Berosus, according to (7) Apollodorus, who flourished in the Year before Christ 144. and according to (8) Abydenus, in the Year before Christ 60.

<i>According to Apollodorus.</i>	<i>According to Abydenus.</i>
<div>Reigned Sari.</div> <div>1. <i>Alorus a Babylonian.</i> - - 10</div>	<div>Reign d Sari.</div> <div>1. <i>Alorus</i>, reigned - - - 10 He gave out that God himself had declar'd him to be the Ruler of the People</div>
2. <i>Alaparus.</i> - - - - 0	2. <i>Alaparus</i> reigned - - - 3
3. <i>Amelon of Pantibibla</i> - - 0	3. <i>Amillarus of Pantibibla</i> 13
4. <i>Ammenon of Chaldæa</i> - - 0	4. <i>Ammenon</i> - - - - 12
5. <i>Megalarus of Pantibibla</i> 18	5. <i>Megalarus of Pantibibla</i> 18
6. <i>Daonus a Shepherd of Pantibibla</i> - - - - } 10	6. <i>Daus a Shepherd of Pantibibla</i> - - - - } 10
7. <i>Euedoreschus of Pantibibla</i> 18	7. <i>Euedoreschus</i> - - - - 0 After <i>Euedoreschus</i> , he saies, some others reigned, and then <i>Xisuthrus</i> .
8. <i>Amempsinus a Chaldæan of Larancha</i> - - - - } 10	8. - - - - - - - - 0
9. <i>Otiartes of Larancha, a Chaldæan</i> - - - - }	9. - - - - - - - - 0
10. His Son <i>Xisuthrus</i> - - - 18 In the Reign of <i>Xisuthrus</i> , he saies, the the great Deluge happened.	10. <i>Xisuthrus</i> - - - - 0

The

The preceding Tables of Antediluvian Kings, shew that *Berosus* computed the Years of their Reigns by *Sari* of Years; and I have observed that a *Sarus* was *ten Years*. In the Catalogue of *Africanus*, the sixth King, *Daonus* has 99 Years only; and therefore his Copy probably had it nine *Sari* and nine Years: but the Copies of *Apollodorus* and *Alexander* called *Polybistor*, with whom *Abydenus* agreed, had it *ten Sari*, i. e. 100 Years. This is one Argument to prove that by *Sari*, *Berosus* meant Decads of Years. And these were the oldest *Chaldean* Years of 360 Days to a Year, as I also have observed. This Account of the *Sarus* is confirmed from the Testimony of *Alexander* called *Polybistor*, who was a most learned Writer of Antiquities, and flourished about the Year before *Christ* 88. He saies that the *Chaldeans* reckoned (9) a *Sarus* to be 3600 Days; a *Nerus* 600 Days; and a *Soffus* 60 Days. So that the *Chaldean Sarus* was ten Years of 360 Days; the *Nerus* was the sixth Part of the *Sarus* or of ten Years: and the *Soffus* was the sixth Part of one Year. *Sarus* without the *Greek* or *Latin* Termination, is the *Chaldean* Word *Sar*, which signifies *ten*; and so a *Sar* of Years, was a Decad of Years, or ten Years. Yet *Abydenus*, though for the most Part he agreed with *Alexander Polybistor* (10) interpreted the *Sarus* to be 3600 Years; the *Nerus* to be 600 Years, and the *Soffus* to be sixty Years; making those to be Years which were really Days only. The Mistake might arise from this, viz. The *Chaldeans* in their ancient Records, called Years and Days by the same

(7) Apud Syncel. p. 39. The Numbers of Years of some of the Reigns are omitted; but they are supplied in *Abydenus* and *Africanus*; and he reckoned 120 *Sari* in the ten Reigns, as Syncellus tells us, *ibid*.

(8) Apud Syncel. p. 38. The Years of the last four Reigns are omitted; but they are supplied in the Catalogues of *Apollodorus* and *Africanus*; and he reckoned 120 *Sari* in the ten Reigns, as *Apollodorus* did, *ibid*.

(9) 'Ο γὰρ παρ' αὐτοῖς [Χαλδαίοις] Σάρεϑ λεγόμενον ἡμέραι εἰς πενταχίλια καὶ ἑξακίςαι· ὁ δὲ Νήρεϑ ἡμέραι ἑξακίςαι· ὁ δὲ Σῶφϑ ἡμέραι ἑξήκοντα. Apud Syncel. Chronog. p. 32.

(10) *Ibid*. p. 38. *Abydenus* in his History not only consulted that of *Berosus*, but probably examined the *Babylonian* Records also; in which the most ancient Computations were made by *Sari*, *Neri*, and *Soffi*, and these were resolved into Days called *Jemin*; and so there was Mention of Myriads, Thousands, &c. of *Jemin*. *Abydenus* taking *Jemin* to mean Years, which Sense it also has, made the *Chaldean* Computations incredible. Word

Word *Jomin* as the *Hebrews* did by the Word *Jamim*. These plural Words signify either Days or Years. Hence the Writers of the *Chaldean* History and Chronology have interpreted the Word *Years*, though it really meant *Days* only: and from this Mistake it is, that they have represented the *Chaldean* Chronology and Computations to contain an immense and incredible Number of *Years*; which being reckoned, as they really were, *Days* only, make their Accounts rational and probable, as will more fully appear in the following Observations.

That in the long Antediluvian Reigns the *Chaldeans* should reckon by *Decads* or Tens of Years is highly probable; and the Reigns are no longer than might be expected. But the Supposition of one King's Reign, or even Life, being 3600 Years; and much more the Supposition of its being ten, twelve, or eighteen Times that Number of Years, (as is supposed by the Reckoning or Interpretation of *Abydenus*) is monstrous, and far exceeds the most fabulous Time ever thought of or pretended: and therefore it cannot with any Reason be imagined that so judicious and exact an Historian as *Berosus* is allowed to be, and whose Accounts generally agree with those of the Scriptures, meant or related any such thing.

The two learned *Egyptian* Monks and (11) Chronologers, *Anianus* and *Panodorus*, who wrote at the same Time, about the Year of *Christ* 400, agreed with *Alexander Polyhistor's* Interpretation of the *Sarus*, etc. as being 3600 *Days*, etc. and not so many *Years*: and also understood all the *Chaldean* Myriads to be *Days* and not *Years*; and blamed *Eusebius* for not so understanding them: and it is evident that *Africanus* thought the *Sarus* was not more than ten Years, by setting down 99 Years for the Reign of one of the Kings, which in other Copies was ten *Sari*.

There is another Interpretation of the *Chaldean Sarus*, mentioned by *Suidas*. He saies (12) a *Sarus* is a *Chaldean Number* [and so saies *Hesychius*] and that 120 *Sari* make (13) 2220 *Years*, according to the

(11) Apud Syncel. Chronograph. p. 17, 35.

(12) Voce Σαροι. vid. Hesych. voce Σάρεϛ.

(13) The Number in *Suidas* is β̅α̅ϛ̅ϛ̅. i.e. 2222. But the final 2 is redundant as *Kuster*, the learned Editor of *Suidas*, observes, after Bishop *Pearson* who observed this before him in his Exposition of the Creed, p. 59. and the Er-

Computation of the Chaldaeans: for, he adds, a *Sarus* is 222 lunar Months, which make 18 Years, and six Months. This valuable Fragment was taken by *Suidas* from some ancient Interpreter of the 120 *Sari* of *Berosus*, which comprehend the Reigns of the ten antediluvian Kings. And it shews that the *Chaldaeans* did not reckon a *Sarus*, as *Abydenus* does, to be 3600 Years: though this Author reckoned it more than *Alexander Polyhistor* did. The Interpretation of this Author probably arose from the Word *Sarus* being supposed not to be derived from *Sar*, ten; but from the *Chaldee* Word *Sara* or *Sabra*, which signifies the Moon; and so a *Sarus* might be thought to be a complete lunar Cycle of Years, which consists of 18 solar Years and 5 Months. But as the ancient *Chaldaeans* reckoned the solar Year to be no more than 360 Days, and the lunar Month to be 30 Days; the 222 lunar Months made 18 and an half lunisolar Years.

The Author of this latter Interpretation of the *Chaldaean Sari*, seems to have thought that the 120 *Sari* of *Berosus*, were the Time of the ten first Generations of Men before the Flood, and made 2220 Years; which differs only 36 Years from the *Greek* Computation in Scripture of the Time from the Creation to the Deluge: and a Tradition of the ten antediluvian Generations might well be preserved amongst the *Chaldaeans* from the Descendants of *Noah*. But the first Interpretation of the *Sarus* as being a Decad of Years only, according to *Alexander Polyhistor*, *Africanus*, *Anianus*, and *Panodorus* is the true one. And as the Epoch of the 120 *Sari* commenced 1200 *Chaldaean* Years, or a little more than 1183 tropical Years before the Flood; we are next to enquire in what Year of the World also this Epoch is to be placed, and was probably placed by the *Chaldaeans*.

error appears from Calculation: so *Suidas* wrote βσλ'. i. e. 2220. But Bishop *Pearson* in the same Place has made a Mistake about *Alexander Polyhistor*, who, he saies, reckoned a *Sarus* 3600 Years, and made the 120 *Sari* of *Berosus* 432000 Years; which is the Computation of *Syncellus* and not of *Alexander*: and *Syncellus* expressly saies, that *Alexander Polyhistor* reckoned them only so many Days, p. 32. and these in solar Years of 365 Days he computes to be 1183 Years, and something more. And again, p. 79. *Syncellus* saies that *Alexander*, and they who followed his Interpretation, reckoned Days instead of Years, τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ τῶν ἀμφοτέρων τὰς ἡμέρας ἔτη καταριθμῆναι.

Moses.

Moses does not directly tell us that there was any Kingdom set up before the Flood : but in the sixth Chapter of *Genesis* he intimates, that after the Earth was grown populous, great Alterations happened in the Manners and State of Men. That a gigantic or warlike Race of Men were born, *ŷ* 4. whose Daughters marrying with the Descendants of *Seth*, bare another Race of robust and mighty, whom he calls *Men of Renown*, *viz.* for their martial Exploits, *ibid.* These Giants are called in the *Hebrew Naphilim*, probably from their great Size, as being able to oppress with *Violence* and *Force*, all who resisted them, or refused to be subject to them. Hence *Symmachus* interpreted the Word by [*βίαιοι*] *violent*, or *Invaders*. So that the Antediluvian Kingdom or Tyranny was an Innovation on the patriarchal Government, under which the Descendants of *Adam* had lived under the several Heads of Families, till an absolute Monarchy was erected by the *Naphilim*, over both the *Cainites* and *Sethites*, by Marriage united into one People.

It is not probable that those Giant-kings, or *Naphilim* began to reign during the Life-time of *Adam*, who lived 930 Years : and as their Kingdom began when the Descendants of *Seth* came down amongst the Descendants of *Cain* and married Wives amongst them ; it is probable that *Cain* was now dead, who is supposed, from ancient Tradition, to have died about the same time with *Adam* (14) or the Year after. It is not credible that any of *Adam's* or of *Seth's* Family would associate with the *Cainites*, and intermarry with them, whilst their wicked Progenitor was alive, whom God had banished from amongst them.

Agreeably to this Account the very ancient Book ascribed to *Enoch* makes the Descendants of *Seth*, called *Egregori*, marry the *Cainite* Women in the Year of the World 1070, as I observed from *Africanus* in the foregoing Papers : and at this Time, or three Years after, the *Chaldæan* Dynasty began.

The *Paschal Chronicle* (15) relates that the first *Chaldæan* Kings mentioned by *Berosus* were the Giants, who are called *mighty Men* and *Men of Renown*, *Gen. vi. 4.* and these are said to be born of the

(14) Syncel. Chronograph. p. 11.

(15) P. 23.

Descendants of *Setb*, who married the Daughters of the *Cainites*. But by the Relation of *Moses* it appears that the Giants, or *Naphilim*, were upon the Earth at the Time when the *Setbites* took Wive amongst the *Cainites*: so that their Progeny reigned some Years after and held the Government till the Flood.

The Countries of *Babylonia*, *Chaldaea*, and *Sufiana*, where the Antediluvians lived, being grown populous, and many Cities built and inhabited, Men began to degenerate from the Simplicity and Piety of the foregoing Ages. Arts of Pleasure and Luxury were invented; and the forging of Brats and Iron into Armour and Weapons of War being found out by the *Cainites*, they began to use them against one another, and to invade each others Rights and Properties: and lived in a lawless, licentious, and irreligious Manner. The *Setbites*, captivated with the Beauty of the *Cainite* Women, and perhaps also charmed with their Singing and Music, took Wives of them, and by mutual Intermarriages became one people with the *Cainites*. This unlawful and forbidden Union corrupted both their Religion and Manners: the Patriarchal Government, invested in the several Heads of Families, was dissolved; and an ambitious and warlike Leader of the *Cainites* set up an absolute Monarchy over all the the Descendants of *Adam*. Under this Kingdom, set up and supported by Violence and Tyranny, Men grew more and more wicked and irreligious. Luxury, Licentiousness, and Profaneness increased; and a general Corruption both of Religion and Manners filled up the Measure of their Iniquities, when God destroyed the whole Race of Mankind (one Family excepted) by a Deluge of Water. This seems to be that *Wickedness* of Men, and those *evil Imaginations which corrupted all Flesh and filled the Earth with Violence*, mentioned (16) by *Moses*, *Gen. vi. 11, 12, 13.*

(16) The Wickedness of the *Setbites*, called *Angels of God* in the Greek Version of the Septuagint, *Gen. vi. 2.* and the Punishment reserved for them in the future State seems to be the best and true Sense of what *St. Peter* and *St. Jude* relate, who both allude to the ancient Book ascribed to *Enoch*. *The Angels* (saies *St. Jude*) *who kept not their first Estate, but left their own Habitation* (to live amongst the wicked *Cainites*) *be hath reserved in everlasting Chains under Darknes, unto the Judgment of the great Day, v. 6.* *St. Peter* speaks to the same Purpose 2 *Ep. ii. 4.* And the Book of *Enoch*

From some ancient Traditions of these Times, preserved at *Babylon*, *Berosus* formed his History of the antediluvian Ages. And if the Reign of the first Antediluvian King *Alorus* commenced in the Year of the World 1070, where the Descent of the *Egregori*, or *Sethites*, and their Marriages with the *Cainites* is placed, this being 1200 *Chaldean* and 1183 tropical Years before the Flood, agrees very exactly, and within 3 Years, to the *Mosaic* Chronology from the Creation to the Flood.

Alexander Polyhistor, in his (17) Relation of the antediluvian History of *Berosus*, observes, agreeably to the Scripture-Account *Gen. vi. 1.* that the Country of *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa* was grown very populous, and was inhabited by a Mixture of different Nations, or People of different Families; which is consonant to the Mixture of those whom *Moses* calls *Sons of God with the Daughters of Men*, *ŷ 2, 4.* The *Sethites* and *Cainites* might well be esteemed to be different Nations, having lived many Centuries in Countries separate from one another: and were by God's Appointment a distinct People, and Aliens to each other. Now it was that, according to *Berosus*, Men were reduced from their savage and disorderly Way of Life to live under (18) Rules of Government; to build Cities and Temples, and to be governed by Laws. And it must be observed for the Probability of the antediluvian Kingdom of *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa*, that these, and the Parts adjacent, were the only Countries of the World which Mankind first inhabited: and no other Country could have Kings over it before the Flood. Accordingly *Alorus* the first King is said to be a *Babylonian*, others were *Chaldeans*, and they all were born in Cities belonging to these Countries. And this probable Foundation of the History of *Berosus*, made

represents God commanding the holy Arch-angels to bind the Leaders of the *Sethites*, and to cast them into the Abyſs untill the Day of Judgment; and afterwards God threatens to destroy the wicked Race proceeding from their Marriages with the *Cainites*, by an universal Deluge. *Syncel. Chronograph. p. 13. 25.*

(17) Ἐν τῇ βαβυλωνίᾳ πολὺ πλῆθος ἀνθρώπων γυνέσθῃ ἀλλοεθνῶν κατοικησάτων καὶ Χαλδαίων· ζῆν δὲ αὐτὰς ἀτάκτως ὥσπερ τὰ θηρία. *Ap. Syncell. Chronograph. p. 28.*

(18) *Ibid.*

Josephus

Josephus, *Eusebius*, and other Writers of the *Chaldaean* Antiquities, as well as *Alexander Polyhistor*, *Abydenus*, and *Apollodorus*, agree that this Kingdom was before (19) the Flood.

Another Observation which I shall make, is, that it is probable that the first *Chaldaean* King *Alorus* was the *Tubal-Cain* of Scripture. An old *Egyptian* Chronicle followed by *Manetho*, in order to vie with the *Chaldeans* for Antiquity, feigned Dynasties of antediluvian Gods or Kings, which they call (20) *Aurites*: by which Name they were called from the first and principal of the *Egyptian* Gods, *Vulcan*. Now *Vulcan*, the first antediluvian God-King of the *Egyptians*, was called by the *Phœnicians* (from whom they borrowed him) *Cbryfor*; as we learn from (21) *Sanchoniatho*: and *Philo Byblius*, who translated the History of *Sanchoniatho* out of the *Phœnician* Language into *Greek*, saies *Cbryfor* was the same with (22) *Hephestus* (or *Vulcan*) as the *Greeks* called him. The learned *Bochart* (23) justly thinks the Name was (𐤀𐤏𐤍𐤔𐤕) *Chores-Ur*, *Chores-Or*, or *Chores-Aur*, as it may be pronounced; and means an *Artificer in Fire*. And the Word *Aurites* is derived from *Aur*, or *Or*, which in the *Phœnician* Language signifies *Fire*. Thus we see how the *Egyptian Aurites* were so called from *Vulcan*, whose *Phœnician* Name was *Cbrys-Or*, or *Cbrys-Aur*. And as the learned *Perizonius* (24) well observes, the Name of the first *Chaldaean* King *Alorus* was (𐤀𐤏𐤍𐤔𐤕) *El-Our*, or *El-Or*, the God of *Fire*. Hence it appears that *Alorus* and *Cbryfor* (*Vulcan*) were the same: and their Names agree to *Tubal-Cain*, who is represented by *Moses* as the first Artist in forging and melting Metals, and in making Instruments of *Brass* and *Iron*, *Gen.* iv. 22. and his Name *Tubal* signifies a *Plate of Brass* or *Iron*. And as *Sanchoniatho*

(19) Syncel. Chronograph. p. 36.

(20) Ibid. p. 51.

(21) Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. i. p. 35.

(22) *Hephestus* and *Cbryfor* are the one a *Phœnician* the other a *Chaldee* Word, and are denominated from *Fire*, *Cbrys-or* is an *Artificer in Fire*, and *Hephestus* or *Apb-est*, is the *Father* or *Inventor of Fire*, which is the known Character of *Vulcan*. See *Bochart. Geog. Sac.* p. 399. and *Buxtorf's Syr.* and *Chald. Lex. voc.* 𐤀𐤏𐤍𐤔𐤕

(23) *Geog. Sac.* p. 706.

(24) *Orig. Ægypt.* c. ii. p. 24.

in Agreement with *Moses* supposes *Chryſor* to be *Tubal-Cain*, who, with his Brother, he ſaies, was (25) *the Inventor of Iron, and of working it*; *Alorus* being the ſame with *Chryſor* (*Vulcan*) muſt be *Tubal-Cain*: and the *Latin Vulcan* ſeems alſo to be a Corruption of *Tubal-Cain*: and *Sanchoniatho* places *Chryſor* in the ſame Deſcent from *Adam*, that *Tubal-Cain* is placed by *Moses*. So they were undoubtedly the ſame. And as *Tubal-Cain* was ſo called from *wrought Metal*: ſo *Chryſor* and *Alorus* were named from the *Fire* by which Metal was wrought. Farther to confirm the Obſervation, that *Alorus* was *Chryſor* (*Vulcan*) or *Tubal-Cain*; the Reign of *Alorus* in the *Chaldæan* Dynaſty commenced in the ſame Year of the World with *Vulcan* in the *Egyptian* Dynaſties; and the Time agrees to the Age of *Tubal-Cain*, by the Analogy of the Generations from *Cain* compared with thoſe from *Seth*, as will be ſhewn under the *Egyptian* Dynaſties hereafter.

Tubal-Cain being the firſt Artificer in Braſs and Iron, probably invented Arms and Inſtruments of War; and ſo was a proper Man to ſet up a Kingdom which was to be ſupported by them.

It is farther obſervable that *Sanchoniatho* ſaies that *Chryſor*, *Hephæſtus*, or *Vulcan*, was, *after his Death*, (26) *worſhiped as a God, and called Diamichius*, that is, *Jupiter the Engineer*: and it is probable that *Alorus* was alſo worſhiped as a God after his Death, and was called *Al-Or*, or *El-Or*, as being *the God of Fire*; and that he was worſhiped at *Ur* in *Chaldæa*; as the God of *Ur*, or *Fire*. And as *Chryſor* was the firſt deified Hero of the *Phœnicians*, ſo *Alorus* was the firſt Hero-God of the *Babylonians* and *Chaldæans*.

It may be objected that 1200 *Chaldæan* or 1183 tropical Years are too few for the Reigns of ten Kings in the antediluvian Ages, when Men

(25) Εξ ὧν γινέσθαι δύο ἀδελφὰς (ιδίῃς εὐρεῖας καὶ τὴν τέτταρτον ἐργασίας) ὧν θάτερον ἦ Χρυσοῦς, etc. Apud Euseb. ubi supra.

(26) Διὸ καὶ ὡς ζεῖν αὐτὸν [Χρυσοῦς] μετὰ θάνατον ἐσεβάδιον καλεῖσθαι τὸν αὐτὸν Διαμίχον. Apud Euseb. ubi sup. *Sanchoniatho* probably called him 𐤀𐤓𐤁𐤏𐤍 i. e. *El-Mechi*, the God of Engines, which *Philo* rendered Διαμίχον. And it is not improbable, but that in these corrupt antediluvian Ages Men might worship the Founder of their Kingdom after his Death: as they did the Founder of the *Babylonian* Kingdom after the Flood.

generally survived their Fathers many more Years than are given to several of these Reigns, as appears from the Genealogies of *Moses* before the Flood: but it may be replied that 118 Years, one with another, agree very well with the Supposition (which is very probable) that these Kings were not always succeeded by their Sons, but sometimes by their Brothers; and that some of their Reigns were shortened by Wars, Invasions, and Usurpations in those last Ages before the Flood, which are by *Moses* represented as filled with Corruption and (27) Violence.

Alexander Polyhistor tells us that *Berosus*, in his first Book of *Babylonian Antiquities*, precedently to his History of the ten antediluvian Kings, mentions the Situation of *Babylonia* between the Rivers *Tigris* and *Euphrates*; also the Products of the Country, Corn, Fruits, Fish, Fowl, and Animals, in which it abounds: and that in the Beginning of the Reign of the first King *Alorus* there came out of the *Red Sea*, and appeared near *Babylonia* (28) an intelligent Animal called *Oannes*

(27) The ancient Book ascribed to *Enoch* relates, that when the *Egregori* or *Sethites* married Wives amongst the *Cainites*, in the 1070th Year of the World; one of the Leaders of them, called *Azael*, or *Azalzel*, taught Men to make *Swords* and *Breast-plates*, and all Kind of *Instruments of War*; and that afterwards Wars ensued, and the Earth was filled with *Violence*, *Bloodshed*, and all kind of *Wickedness* and *Impiety*. *Syncel. Chronog.* p. 12, 13. This shews that the most ancient Traditions of the *Jews* made the forging and working of *Brass* and *Iron* to be invented in the 1070th Year of the World, or soon after: though they ascribed the Invention and Art to one of the *Egregori*, or *Descendants* of *Seth*, and not to *Tubal-Cain*, whom *Moses* speaks of as the Inventor and first Artificer in *Brass* and *Iron*. But this is a concurring Evidence, that the Time of the first *Chaldean* King *Alorus* and of the first *Egyptian* King *Vulcan* before the Flood, who were no other than *Tubal-Cain*, commenced in the Year of the World 1070, or 1073. And as the *Chaldeans* and *Egyptians* agreed in computing the same Time from these Kings to the Flood, viz. 1183 Years, and something more, it is an Argument highly deserving notice, that the most ancient *Chaldean* and *Egyptian* Records computed the Period from the Creation to the Flood to be very near if not exactly the same Term of Years that *Moses* reckoned it in his History.

(28) In the *Greek* of *Syncellus*, p. 28. it is called ζῷον ᾠσφρον, i. e. an *irrational* Animal. But as the Description of it shews it was endued with Reason and Intelligence, and was a divine Animal afterwards adored by the *Babylonians*; it should be read ζῷον ὠσφρον, a *rational*, *intelligent*, or *wise Ani-*

(which

(which *Apollodorus* also mentions) which had the whole Body of a Fish; but beneath the Fish's Head it had another Head, which was human; and also the Feet of a Man, which came out of the Fish's Tail. It had also an human Voice: and the Image (*Berosus* said) was preserved in his Time. This Account shews what the Animal really was; and that it was a real Man, cloathed with the entire Skin of a Fish. The Tail of the Fish-skin was joined to the Thighs, and hung below them, so that the Man's Feet came, as it were, out of the Fish's Tail.

Alexander adds, (29) this Animal conversed with Men in the Day-time, without eating any Thing; and he delivered to them the Knowledge of Letters, and of various Arts and Sciences. He taught them to live together in Cities; to erect Temples; to enact Laws; and he instructed them in Geometry. He shewed them also how to gather and lay up Seeds and Fruits: and in short, he instructed them in every Thing necessary to civilize their Manners. This *Oannes* also wrote of the Origin of Things, and of civil Government; and delivered to Men an Account of the Creation, as it there follows.

mal. So Ὀφρεὺς ὤρεγ, *sapientes boræ*, *Homer. Hymn. in Apoll. v. 194.* But the Hymn, though very ancient, seems not to have been wrote by *Homer*. *Isaac Vossius* thinks that *Berosus* wrote ζῶον ἄρρεν, *De LXXII. Interpret. p. 409.* but this is not so probable. But *Vossius* is much mistaken in thinking that *Oannes* was *Noah*, and appeared immediately after the Flood. It is evident that he appeared before the Flood; and at the Beginning of the Antediluvian Kingdom, which was 1183 Years before the Flood; and which was related in the second Book of *Berosus's* Antiquities, *Syncel. p. 30.* This Sea-God was undoubtedly the *Babylonian* Fish-God called *Dagon*, from *Dag* (ג) a Fish; and was in the most ancient times worshiped by the *Babylonians*, *Syrians*, *Phœnicians*, and *Philistines*. He seems to be the *Odacon*, Ὀδάκων, which probably was wrote Ὁ Δάγων, mentioned by *Abydenus*; who, he saies, appeared in the Reign of the seventh antediluvian King; and was the fifth and last Fish-God. *Syncel. p. 39.* The Idol *Dagon* had Hands, Feet, and perhaps an human Face, and is mentioned *1 Sam. v. 2, 3, 4.* and *Jud. xvi. 23.* and *1 Mac. x. 83, 84.* and *1 Chron. x. 10.* *Oannes* or *Dagon* is the same Idol, only of a different Sex, with the *Phœnician Derceto*, or *Atargatis*, *Ashtaroth*, or *Astarte*, whom *Diodorus Siculus* describes, *Hist. lib. ii. p. 116.* Edit. *Wesseling.* τέμνη θεῶν ὁμοφανῆς, ἐν ὀνομάζεσθαι οἱ Σύροι Δερκεῖν αὐτὴν ἢ τὸ μὴ πρόσωπον ἔχει γυναικὸς, τὸ δ' ἄλλο (ῶμα) πᾶν ἰχθύος. *Lucian's* Description is nearer to that of *Berosus*, Δερκεῖς ἢ εἶδος ἐν Φοινίκη ἐθεοσάμην, θεῖμα ξένον ἱμισέη μὲν γυνή· τὸ δ' ὅκιστον ἐν μηρῶν ἐς ἄκρας πόδας ἰχθύος ἔχει ἀπολείπει. *De Dea Syr. p. 1061.*

(29) Apud *Syncel. p. 28, 29, 30.*

Other Authors have made Mention of this Sea-God *Oannes*. *Heladius* (30) calls him *Oes*, which probably was wrote contractedly, *Oes* for *Oannes*; or else it is an Error of the Transcriber. This Author calls him *a Man who came out of the Red Sea, and had the Head, Feet, and Hands of a Man; but the other Parts were those of a Fish: and saies, He taught Astronomy and Letters: That he was really a Man, and appeared only to be a Fish, because he was clothed with a Fish's Skin.*

Hyginus likewise (31) relates that *Euabanes*, (falsly printed *Eubadnes*) a Name not much unlike *Oannes*, came out of the *Red Sea* in *Chaldaea*, and taught Astrology.

From this Account of the *Babylonian Oannes* we may observe that the *Chaldaeans* thought that Letters were known before the Flood: the *Egyptians* and *Jews* were of the same Opinion; and each of these People claimed the Invention of them. But the Origin and Antiquity of Letters, will be largely considered, in a particular Dissertation, hereafter.

I shall proceed to give from *Berosus*, as cited by *Alexander Polybistor* and *Abydenus*, the *Babylonian* History of the Flood, to shew the Agreement of this ancient Account with that of *Moses* in the Scripture.

When (32) *Otiartes* was dead, he was succeeded by his Son *Xisutbrus*, in whose Reign the great Deluge came upon the Earth: the History of which is related in the following Manner. *Saturn* (33) appeared to *Xisutbrus* in a Dream, and told him that on the fifteenth Day of the Month (34) *Dæsius*, Mankind should be destroyed by a Flood. Therefore he commanded him to write down an History of the Origine, intermediate State and End of all Things, and to bury the Writings un-

(30) Apud Phot. Bibliothec. Cod. 279. p. 1594.

(31) Fab. 274.

(32) *Otiartes* is the true Name, as *Cyril of Alexandria* cites it from *Alexander Polybistor*. lib. i. cont. Jul. p. 8. and not *Ardates*, as *Syncellus* cites it, p. 30. and *Scaliger* has *Otiartes* in his *Greek Chronicon*.

(33) *Saturn* (Κεῖν) means God, who appeared to *Noah*, here called *Xisutbrus*, and told him that he would destroy all Mankind with a Deluge of Water. *Gen.* vi. 13, 17.

(34) *Dæsius* was the second *Macedonian* Month after the vernal Equinox, which was fixed to the first Day of the preceding Month called *Artemisus*, so

der Ground in (35) *Sipparæ*, the City of the Sun: then he ordered him to build a Ship, and to go into it with his Kindred and Friends; also to

Galen assures us, and these *Macedonian* Months were used by the *Greeks* in lesser *Asia*, and also in *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa*, as *Ptolemy* observes in his *Almagest* or *Astronomy*. But the *Greeks* in *Syria*, *Phœnicia*, and *Judæa*, called *Syro-Macedonians* placed the Beginning of the Months one Month later. So according to the *Babylonian* Records used by *Berosus*, the Flood commenced on the 25th Day of *April*, according to the Place of the vernal Equinox on the 10th Day of *March*. This was only two Days before the Time mentioned in the *Hebrew* Text, which is the 17th Day of the second Month, *Gen.* vii. 11. But it should be the 27th Day, as I have before observed to be the Reading of the *Septuagint* Version, and of *Josephus*, from older and more correct *Hebrew* Copies. So the old *Babylonian* Records placed the Flood twelve Days sooner than *Moses* placed it in his Account, but, which is remarkable, in the same Month of the Year, i. e. the second Month from the vernal Equinox, when the *Chaldæan* Year commenced; and where I have proved in foregoing Observations, that the original Year of the World commenced. The Place of *Galen* referred to above in this Note, being decisive for the Situation of the *Macedonian* Month *Dæsius*, I shall transcribe it, viz: "Εὐὸν προμάρτη τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς Διὰ μὲν τῆς ὁθινοπώρας γίνεσθαι εἰσημερίαν εἴσεται [οἷσσαι edit. male] τὴν μὲν χειμερινὴν τροπὴν, ὥς μὲν τρεῖς μῆνας ἰσομένην ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς κατ' αὐτὴς [ita *Petavius*, edit. εἰαυτὸν] Περίλη μῆνος· τὸτο γὰρ [τὸττω edit. male] σημαίνει καὶ Μακεδόνας· τὴν δὲ ἐαρινὴν ἰσημερίαν Ἀρλεμισίον, καθάπερ γὰρ καὶ τὴν θερινὴν [τροπὴν] ὁ Δῶς. κατὰ γὰρ τὰς ἀρχὰς τῶν εἰρημένων μῆνων αὐτὴ ἰσημερία καὶ αἱ τροπαὶ γίνονται καὶ Μακεδόνας. Com. 1. in lib. i. Hippoc. Epidem. p. 347. edit. Basil. 1538. For the *Macedonian* and *Syro-Macedonian* Months, see *Petav.* Doct. Temp. lib. i. p. 75, 76. Uffer. de Asian. An. Solari. p. 7, 12. and p. 55. Beveredg. Chronol. p. 53. Dodwell de Cycl. p. 838, 839. Noris, Syro-Mac. p. 22.

(35) It is *Σιππάραις*, *Sisparis*, in *Syncel.* p. 30, 31. But *Eusebius* Præp. Ev. lib. ix. c. 12. and *Cyrl.* Alex. cont. Jul. lib. i. p. 8. cite it from *Abydenus*, *Σιππάραισιν*, *Sipparis*. It was so called from the Books or Records laid up there: [ספרא] *Siphra*, *Siphraia*, or *Sippara*. *Ptolemy* calls it *Sippbara*; and places it in *Mesopotamia*, near the *Euphrates*, and between *Babylon* and *Nineveh*. And this City, no doubt, was the *Sepharvaim* of Scripture, as the learned *Junius* understands it in 2 *Kings* xvii. 24. and where the *Sun* or *Saturn* was, in after Ages, worshiped with human Sacrifices, 2 *Kings* xvii. 31. It is the same City that *Apollodorus* and *Abydenus* call *Pantibibla*, where several of the Antediluvian Kings were born. See *Scaliger's* Notes on the Fragments, at the End of his Book, *De Emend. Temp.* p. 44. *Cellar.* Geograph. Antiq. lib. iii. c. 15. p. 611. *Cumberland's* *Sanchoniatho*, p. 225, 226. *Universal Hist.* p. 91. in the Notes, and *Sir Isaac Newton's* Chronol. p. 275. and *Bechart's* Geog. Sac. lib. i. c. 4. p. 22. It is a Name of the plural Number as *Sepharvaim* is, and so I render it *Sipparæ*. And according to *Berosus*, it

furnish the Vessel with Provisions, and to take into it Fowls and four-footed Beasts, and when he had thus provided every Thing, if he was asked whither he intended to sail, he should say, *To the Gods*, (36) *to pray for Happiness to Mankind*. *Xisutbrus* did not disobey the divine Command, but (37) built a Vessel, in Length five Furlongs, and in Breadth two Furlongs; and having got all Things ready, he put on board his Wife, Children, and Friends. After the Flood was at the Height, and soon began to abate, *Xisutbrus* let out certain Birds, (*viz.* a Raven and a (38) Dove, *Gen.* viii. 7, 8.) which finding no Food, nor a Place to rest in, returned again to the Ship, (7 9.) *Xisutbrus*, after some Days, (*viz.* seven Days, *Gen.* viii. 10.) let the Birds out again; but they came a second Time back to the Ship, having their Feet daubed with Mud. (*Moses* saies the Dove came back with an Olive-leaf in her Mouth, 7 11.) but being let out the third Time, they returned no more to the Ship (*Gen.* viii. 12.) hereby *Xisutbrus* understood that dry Land appeared (*Gen.* viii. 13.) Then he opened the Side of the Ship, and seeing that it rested on a certain Mountain, he went out of it with his Wife, and Daughter, and Pilot; and having worshiped the Earth, and raised an Altar, and sacrificed to the Gods, (see *Gen.* viii. 20.) he, and those who went out with him, disappeared. But they who staid in the Ship, finding that *Xisutbrus*, and those who accompanied him, did not return, went out to seek him, calling him aloud by his Name: but *Xisutbrus* was seen no more by them; but his Voice was heard to come out of the Air, commanding them, as their Duty was, to be religious: and informed them that he himself, on Account of his Piety, was gone from

was in *Babylonia*, and about where *Babylon* was afterwards built. *Scaliger* found it wrote Σιπταρέσις in his Copy. See his *Greek Chronicon* p. 8.

(36) *Gear's* Copy of *Syncellus* reads εὐξάωρον: but *Scaliger* has it εὐξόμωρον, in the future Tense, which I prefer. See his *Greek Chronicon*, p. 8.

(37) This Account shews that the Ark of *Noah* was built in *Chaldæa*, not far from *Babylon*, where *Xisutbrus* lived; and this most probably was the Place. See *Bochart. Phaleg. lib. i. c. 4.*

(38) *Plutarch* relates, from ancient Mythologists, that *Deucalion*, in the Time of the Flood, let out a Dove from the Ark, to give him Notice of the Weather, which came in again when the Rain continued, but flew away when it was fair. *De Solert. Animal* p. 968. This is a Remain of the Scripture Account of the Flood.

them

them to dwell with the Gods; and that his Wife, Daughter and Pilot, were Partakers of the same Honour. He also told them that they should go again to *Babylon*; and that as it was ordained for them, they should take the Writings from *Sipparæ*, and communicate them to Mankind: and he added that the Place where they then were, was in the Country of *Armenia*. When they had heard this, they offered Sacrifice to the Gods; and unanimously went to *Babylon*, — and when they came thither, they dug up the Writings at *Sipparæ*, built many Cities, raised Temples, and rebuilt *Babylon* again.

There is no Doubt but that in the Description of the Flood by *Berosus* from the most ancient *Babylonian* Annals, the *Noachic* Deluge is meant; and that *Xisuthrus*, the tenth and last antediluvian King preserved with his Family and Friends in a Ship, is *Noah*, who with his Wife, three Sons, and their Wives, was preserved in an Ark. The Time of the Flood, and the Particulars preceding, and happening during the Continuance of it, and also following it, do very remarkably agree with the Scripture-History: and it is very observable, that as *Berosus* related that *Xisuthrus* was never seen after he went out of the Ark, and had offered Sacrifice to God for his Preservation; so *Moses* having related what happened soon after the Flood was over, tells not what became of *Noah*, but only that he lived after the Flood 350 Years. *Gen. ix. 28.* The Account of the Flood by *Abydenus* in *Syncellus* (p. 38.) is shorter, but agrees entirely to that of *Alexander Polyhistor*: And the whole Relation of it shews that very ancient Accounts of the first Ages of the World, and of the universal Deluge, were preserved in *Chaldæa* and *Babylon*, which were originally the same with those which *Moses* wrote, and in the main agreed with them, though they had been disguised and mixed with Fables.

There was an ancient Tradition of the universal Flood amongst the *Greeks*, which (39) *Lucian* mentions to have happened in the Age of the *Scythian Deucalion*; and which evidently relates to that of *Noah*, and not to the *Thessalian* Flood, in the later Time of the *Greek Deucalion*. *Lucian* was told, that the then Race of Men were not the first, but that the first Race was entirely destroyed: and that the Men then in being, were a second Race descended from *Deucalion*,

(39) De Dea Syr. p. 1060. Edit. Paris. Bourdelot.

which were grown very numerous. That the first Race committed Acts of Violence and Injustice; neither kept their Oaths, nor used Hospitality, nor did Mercy. On which Account the greatest Calamity befel them. For immediately, *the Earth poured forth [viz. from the Abyss] a great Flood of Water; and great Showers of Rain fell down; and the Rivers overflowed more than usual; and the Sea swelled to a great Height; so that the whole Earth was covered with Water, and all Mankind perished, except Deucalion, who was preserved to be the Father of a second Generation, on the Account of his Wisdom and Piety.* Then he relates, that *Deucalion was saved in an Ark, into which he took his Children, and Wives, and all Kinds of Land-Animals by Pairs of each, which came to him. And these sailed with him in the Ark as long as the Flood prevailed.* Hence we may observe that as (40) *Josephus* saies, *all the barbarian Historians make Mention of the universal Deluge and Ark:* He means the Writers of the *Chaldean, Phœnician*, and many other Histories, both *Eastern and Greek.*

I come next to enquire when the new *Babylonian* Kingdom after the Flood commenced. *Berosus* related, that, after the Flood, they who were preserved in the Ship or Ark, resorted to *Babylon*, which City they rebuilt. So that, by his Account, the first Kingdom erected after the Flood was at *Babylon*.

— This is entirely agreeable to the History of *Moses*, who speaks of *Babel* or *Babylon* as being the Seat of the first Kingdom where *Nimrod* Son of *Cush*, the Son of *Ham*, was the first King after the Dispersion of the Descendants of *Noah*, *Gen. x. 10.*

Alexander Polyhistor (41) reckoned from the Flood to *Evechous*, the second *Chaldean* King in the postdiluvian Dynasty of *Berosus*, 243 Years and 8 Months, which were computed by *Sari*, *Neri*, and *Soffi*. This was owing to *Berosus's* Supposition of a great Number of Persons being preserved in the Ark, who renewed the *Babylonian* Kingdom in the Space of 149 Years; and that *Evechous* reigned 94 Years and 8 Months, after the Beginning of the new Kingdom;

(40) *Antiq. Jud. lib. i. c. 3.*

(41) *Apud Syncel. Chronog. p. 78.*

and was the second of a Dynasty of seven Kings who reigned 190 Years.

But we are assured from the History of *Moses*, that no more than eight Persons were saved in the universal Deluge: and that the *Babylonian* Kingdom was set up by *Nimrod*, upon the Dispersion of the Descendants of *Noah*, which happened at the Birth of *Peleg*, which was in the Year of the World 2788, and 531 Years after the Flood, and in the Year before the vulgar Christian Æra 2638.

It is farther observable, that *Alexander Polyhistor* (42) represents the *Chaldaean* Computations by *Sari*, *Neri*, and *Sossi*, and *Myriads*, &c. to be laid aside from the Reign of *Evechous* [Mens Lives and their Reigns becoming much shorter than they were before] and that they were made by solar Years. The Times of those who were accounted Gods and Demi-gods before and after the Flood, were reckoned amongst the *Chaldæans*, by Myriads, Thousands, and Hundreds of Years, by which they meant Days only, as *Alexander Polyhistor* and others inform us: and the *Egyptians* reckoned them by Thousands of Years, by which they meant Months only, as will be demonstrated hereafter. And it is very remarkable, that the *Egyptians* as well as the *Chaldæans*, after the Time of their Gods and Demi-gods, left off their large Numbers, and reckoned the Reigns of their Heroes, and first Establishers of Kingdoms by real solar Years; and this too very nearly at the same Time. For the *Egyptian* Reckoning by solar Years began with the *Cynic* Circle of *Mezraites* in the Year of the World 2810, and 553 Years after the Flood; and in the Year before *Christ*, 2616.

Berosus [as *Alexander Polyhistor* (43) tells us] related that *there were Annals at Babylon kept with great Care, which comprehended a Term of above fifteen Myriads of Years, in which was contained the History of the Origin of Things, of the Heaven, and Earth, and Sea, and the Actions*

(42) Ibid.

(43) Ἀναγραφαὶ δὲ, πολλῶν ἐν Βαβυλῶνι φυλάσσεσθαι μὲν πολλῆς ἐπιμελείας ὧν ἐτῶν πρὸς ἑπτα μυριάδων δεκακαπέντε περιέχουσας χροῖον· περιέχειν δὲ τὰς ἀναγραφαὶς ἰστορίας περὶ τῶν ἀρχῶν καὶ θαλάσσης καὶ πρωτογονίας καὶ βασιλείων καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὰς πράξεων. Apud Syncel. Chronograph. p. 28. almost the same Words are recited, p. 14. where after ἀρχῶν is added καὶ γῆς, and δεκαπέντε instead of δεκακαπέντε.

of their Kings from the Beginning. These Annals commenced from the Time of the Antediluvian *Oannes*, who is said to have been the first who wrote of the Origin of Things, and of political Government: and I have shewn that *Alexander Polybistor* reckoned the Myriads of Years to be *Days* only. So fifteen Myriads or 150 Thousand Days, are no more than 416 *Chaldean* Years, and eight Months. And yet these Records are supposed to contain the History of the Creation, and of the oldest *Babylonian* Kings both before and after the Flood, whose Times were reckoned from *Alorus* to the Flood, something more than 1183 solar Years; and thence to *Evechous* 243 Years and 8 Months, in all 1426 Years and 8 Months, when the reckoning by Myriads of Years, and by *Sari*, *Neri*, and *Soffi*, into which they were resolved, was laid aside. Hence it is evident, that these 15 Myriads related only to the most early Times of the *Chaldean* History; and the Annals which contained this Space of Time could not contain a Term which was above fifty Myriads of the same Years or Days; and which was 1426 tropical Years and 8 Months. Wherefore the Expression in *Syncellus* is a corrupt Reading, and *Berosus* wrote (44) *more than ten Times five, or fifty Myriads*: from which Date *Berosus* began the Origin of the *Chaldean* History, from the Appearance of the Sea-God *Oannes*, and the Beginning of the Reign of *Alorus* the first Gyant-King before the Flood. And the Time of the ten Antediluvian Kings, made 43 Myriads, and two thousand Years or Days, or 432000 Days, which were 120 *Sari*, and 1200 *Chaldean* Years, in the Computation of *Berosus*, as *Syncellus* observes (p. 17.) *Berosus* also reckoned from the Flood to *Evechous* the second *Chaldean* King, eight Myriads, 7720 Years or Days, or 243 solar Years of 360 Days, and eight Months. By this Reckoning the *Babylonian* Records made use of by *Berosus*, contained a Term of fifty one Myriads, 9720 Years or Days; which might be called more than 50 Myriads; and therefore *Alexander Polybistor* and *Berosus* wrote not fifteen Myriads, but fifty Myriads.

(44) The Copy of *Syncellus* has δεκαπέντε p. 14. and δεκακαπέντε, p. 28. and the latter Word I take to be a Corruption of δεκάς πέντε, which was the genuine original Reading.

Africanus in *Syncellus* p. 17. mentions 48 Myriads of *Chaldaean* Years or Days, or 1333 solar *Chaldaean* Years, and four Months, which reached to 133 Years and four Months after the Flood; and here *Berosus* might place the Epoch of the new *Babylonian* Kingdom: though I have placed it above, from *Syncellus*, 149 Years after the Flood, according to the Computation he gives from *Alexander Polybistor*. However a Difference of 16 Years is not material: and the preceding Computations shew, that the immense and incredible Number of supposed *Chaldaean* Years being reduced to Days, as they really were, and reckoned from their true Epoch, is very agreeable to the true Chronology of Scripture, and differs as little from it as can be expected, in such long Periods of the most ancient Times.

I shall next consider what other Writers have said of the *Chaldaean* Computations; and correct the Mistakes in some of them.

Pliny says the (45) *Affyrians* [or *Babylonians*] had always the Use of Letters: and that the *Egyptians* had them before the Age of *Phoroneus*, who was thought to be the most ancient King in *Greece*. And to shew the high Antiquity of the *Babylonian* Letters, *Pliny* adds; that *Epigenes*, (46) an Author of principal Note and Regard, [who had studied amongst the *Chaldaeans* their Learning, as *Seneca* relates. *Nat. Quæst.*

(45) Literas semper arbitror Affyrias fuisse—Anticlides in Ægypto invenisse quendam nomine Menona tradit xv annis ante Phoroneum antiquissimum Græciæ Regem, idque monumentis adprobare conatur. *Nat. Hist. lib. vii. c. 56.* Had *Pliny* wrote from *Anticlides* xv Myriads, it would have agreed to the Time of *Menes*, who seems to be meant by *Menon*. For these Myriads being Days, made about 411 *Julian* Years: and *Phoroneus* reigned in the Year before *Christ* 1780, or before, as the *Greeks* reckoned. These two Sums added, bring *Menon* to the Year before *Christ* 2191, which fell in the Reign of the first *Egyptian* King *Menes*, as will be shewn; whose Secretary of State and chief Counsellor was *Hermes*, who is generally thought to have been the Inventor of Letters. Of this let the learned Reader judge.

(46) *Epigenes* apud *Babylonios* 720 [adde M. i. e. millia] annorum observationes siderum coctilibus laterculis inscriptas docet gravis auctor in primis: qui minimum, *Berosus* et *Critodemus* 480 [adde M.] annorum, ex quo apparet æternus literarum usus. *Hist. Nat. lib. vii. c. 56.* Or *Pliny* might write 720 and 480, that is, seven hundred and twenty thousand, and four hundred and eighty thousand; the thousands being denoted amongst the ancient *Roman* Writers by a Line drawn over the numeral Letters, as the learned Ro-

of their Kings from the Beginning. These Annals commenced from the Time of the Antediluvian *Oannes*, who is said to have been the first who wrote of the Origin of Things, and of political Government: and I have shewn that *Alexander Polybistor* reckoned the Myriads of Years to be *Days* only. So fifteen Myriads or 150 Thousand Days, are no more than 416 *Chaldean* Years, and eight Months. And yet these Records are supposed to contain the History of the Creation, and of the oldest *Babylonian* Kings both before and after the Flood, whose Times were reckoned from *Alorus* to the Flood, something more than 1183 solar Years; and thence to *Evechous* 243 Years and 8 Months, in all 1426 Years and 8 Months, when the reckoning by Myriads of Years, and by *Sari*, *Neri*, and *Soffi*, into which they were resolved, was laid aside. Hence it is evident, that these 15 Myriads related only to the most early Times of the *Chaldean* History; and the Annals which contained this Space of Time could not contain a Term which was above fifty Myriads of the same Years or Days; and which was 1426 tropical Years and 8 Months. Wherefore the Expression in *Syncellus* is a corrupt Reading, and *Berosus* wrote (44) *more than ten Times five, or fifty Myriads*: from which Date *Berosus* began the Origin of the *Chaldean* History, from the Appearance of the Sea-God *Oannes*, and the Beginning of the Reign of *Alorus* the first Gyant-King before the Flood. And the Time of the ten Antediluvian Kings, made 43 Myriads, and two thousand Years or Days, or 432000 Days, which were 120 *Sari*, and 1200 *Chaldean* Years, in the Computation of *Berosus*, as *Syncellus* observes (p. 17.) *Berosus* also reckoned from the Flood to *Evechous* the second *Chaldean* King, eight Myriads, 7720 Years or Days, or 243 solar Years of 360 Days, and eight Months. By this Reckoning the *Babylonian* Records made use of by *Berosus*, contained a Term of fifty one Myriads, 9720 Years or Days; which might be called more than 50 Myriads; and therefore *Alexander Polybistor* and *Berosus* wrote not fifteen Myriads, but fifty Myriads.

(44) The Copy of *Syncellus* has δεκαπέντε p. 14. and δεκακαπέντε, p. 28. and the latter Word I take to be a Corruption of δεκάς πέντε, which was the genuine original Reading.

Africanus in *Syncellus* p. 17. mentions 48 Myriads of *Chaldaean* Years or Days, or 1333 solar *Chaldaean* Years, and four Months, which reached to 133 Years and four Months after the Flood; and here *Berosus* might place the Epoch of the new *Babylonian* Kingdom: though I have placed it above, from *Syncellus*, 149 Years after the Flood, according to the Computation he gives from *Alexander Polyhistor*. However a Difference of 16 Years is not material: and the preceding Computations shew, that the immense and incredible Number of supposed *Chaldaean* Years being reduced to Days, as they really were, and reckoned from their true Epoch, is very agreeable to the true Chronology of Scripture, and differs as little from it as can be expected, in such long Periods of the most ancient Times.

I shall next consider what other Writers have said of the *Chaldaean* Computations; and correct the Mistakes in some of them.

Pliny says the (45) *Affyrians* [or *Babylonians*] had always the Use of Letters: and that the *Egyptians* had them before the Age of *Phoroneus*, who was thought to be the most ancient King in *Greece*. And to shew the high Antiquity of the *Babylonian* Letters, *Pliny* adds; that *Epigenes*, (46) an Author of principal Note and Regard, [who had studied amongst the *Chaldeans* their Learning, as *Seneca* relates. *Nat. Quæst.*

(45) *Literas semper arbitror Affyrias fuisse—Anticlides in Ægypto invenisse quendam nomine Menona tradit xv annis ante Phoroneum antiquissimum Græciæ Regem, idque monumentis adprobare conatur. Nat. Hist. lib. vii. c. 56.* Had *Pliny* wrote from *Anticlides* xv Myriads, it would have agreed to the Time of *Menes*, who seems to be meant by *Menon*. For these Myriads being Days, made about 411 *Julian* Years: and *Phoroneus* reigned in the Year before *Christ* 1780, or before, as the *Greeks* reckoned. These two Sums added, bring *Menon* to the Year before *Christ* 2191, which fell in the Reign of the first *Egyptian* King *Menes*, as will be shewn; whose Secretary of State and chief Counsellor was *Hermes*, who is generally thought to have been the Inventor of Letters. Of this let the learned Reader judge.

(46) *Epigenes apud Babylonios 720 [adde M. i. e. millia] annorum observationes fiderum coctilibus laterculis inscriptas docet gravis auctor in primis: qui minimum, Berosus et Critodemus 480 [adde M.] annorum, ex quo apparet æternus literarum usus. Hist. Nat. lib. vii. c. 56.* Or *Pliny* might write 720 and 480, that is, seven hundred and twenty thousand, and four hundred and eighty thousand; the thousands being denoted amongst the ancient *Roman* Writers by a Line drawn over the numeral Letters, as the learned *Ro-*

lib vii. c. 3.] informs us that the Babylonians had celestial Observations wrote upon Tiles, (47) for a Course of 720 Years: and the lowest Computation of them by Berosus and Critodemus, was 480 Years. Whence, saies he, it appears that the Use of Letters is eternal, or from all Ages.

Thus all the present Copies of *Pliny* read. But could *Pliny* give that for a Proof of the Eternity or highest Antiquity of the Babylonian Letters and Writing, which made them many Hundreds of Years later than *Cadmus* and the *Græcian* Letters? Nay, the latter Account of *Berosus* and *Critodemus* made them some Hundreds of Years later than the Writings of *Homer*. *Hardouin*, the Editor of *Pliny*, not knowing what to make of this Passage, would have the Numbers to stand as they are, but to commence before the *Trojan* War. This is a mere Hypothesis; and it is not, I think, to be doubted but that *Pliny* wrote from *Epigenes* 720 thousand Years; and from *Berosus* and *Critodemus* 480 thousand Years: and that the numeral Letter M, which signifies a thousand, has been omitted by the Transcribers, who probably left it out, as thinking the Numbers absurd with it.

The learned *Isaac Vossius* made the same Observation and Correction of *Pliny's* Words, in his Letter to *Christianus Scotamus*, p. 132. of the Appendix to his Dissertation on the Version of the Septuagint. But

our Grammarian *Valerius Probus* informs us. Sciendum quod quælibet figura, si ei jacens recta linea supraducatur, tot significabit millenarios, quot per se significat unitates: ut $\overline{\text{I}}$ mille unitates, id est mille significat, $\overline{\text{V}}$ quinque millia, $\overline{\text{X}}$ decem millia, $\overline{\text{L}}$ quinquaginta millia, $\overline{\text{C}}$ centum millia. &c. De Not. Romanor. lib. p. 1478. inter Auctores linguæ latinæ edit. a Dionys. Gothofredo, 1622. If *Pliny* wrote his Numbers in this Manner; the small Line drawn over the numeral Letters might easily be erased or omitted in his Copies.

(47) Writing upon Stone or Tile was the most ancient Way; and the former was used in *Phœnicia* and *Egypt* by *Taut* or *Totb*, who wrote his History of the first Ages, and his Theology, on Pillars, or Tables of Stone: and perhaps *Belus* first taught the *Babylonians* and *Chaldeans* the way of writing on Tile at *Babylon*, where there was no Stone. And therefore the Prophet *Ezechiël* at *Babylon* is ordered to make a symbolical Portray of *Jerusalem* upon a Tile, which was to be a prophetic Sign of its Destruction by the King of *Babylon*. ch. iv. § 1. etc.

then

then *Vossius* did not consider that these old *Chaldean* Years were *Days* only; nor did he know the Epoch of them.

The learned (48) *Perizonius*, in his *Babylonian* Antiquities, saw the Passage of *Pliny* was corrupt, and that the numeral Letter M, signifying *Thousands*, was to be added, to make it Sense and consistent: but he was not able to settle the Epoch of the *Chaldean* Computations, nor considered that the immense Number of Years were *Days* only.

That the foregoing Correction of *Pliny's* Words is undoubtedly right may be proved also from *Diodorus Siculus* (49) and *Cicero* (50). The first of whom relates that the *Babylonians* or *Chaldeans* had made *astronomical Observations 47 Myriads and three thousand Years to the Time of Alexander's Expedition into Asia*: and the latter saies, *the Babylonians boasted of having Written Annals of celestial Observations for 470 Thousands of Years*.

Hence we may be sure that *Pliny* wrote 480 Thousand Years, as *Diodorus Siculus* has 473 Thousand, and *Cicero* 470 Thousand. And *Pliny's* Number is plainly no other than that of *Berosus*, which *Africanus* mentions in *Syncellus*, p. 17. and which was 48 Myriads, or 480 thousand Years. And these *Berosus* dated, as I have shewn above, from the Appearance of *Oannes*, the first Teacher of Letters and Science amongst the *Chaldeans* before the Flood, and from the Beginning of the Reign of the first antediluvian King *Alorus*. Therefore our modern learned Chronologers *Scaliger*, *Gerhard* *John Vossius*, *Sir John Marsham*, and *Mr. Dodwell* are greatly mistaken in applying *Pliny's* Number 480 Years (not suspecting an Error in the Text) to the Beginning of the *Æra of Nabonassar*, with which it has nothing to do. For *Pliny* applies it to shew the high Antiquity of *Letters*, which no body can doubt but that amongst the *Chaldeans*, and even

(48) See his *Origin. Babylonica*. cap. 1, 2.

(49) ἐτῶν ἐπὶ τῇ τετραρχικῇ μυριάδι καὶ τρεῖς ὄντι ταύταις χιλιάδας εἰς τὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου Βασιλεῖα γεγονέναι καὶ αὐθιγμοῖς, ἀφ' οὗ τὸ παλαιὸν ἤρξαντο τῶν ἄστρον ταῖς ποιεῖσθαι. *Biblioth. lib. ii. p. 145.* Edit *Wesseling*.

(50) *Contemnamus Babylonios eos qui ex Caucaso cœli signa servantes numeris et motibus stellarum cursus persequuntur — qui 470 millia annorum, ut ipsi dicunt, monumentis comprehensa continent. De Divinat. lib. i. c. 19.* Again; *Aliunt quadringenta et septuaginta millia annorum in periclitandis experiundisque pueris — Babylonios posuisse. Ibid. lib. ii. c. 46.*

amongst the *Greeks* and *Latins* they were many Centuries older than that *Æra*.

These *Babylonian* and *Chaldean* Myriads and Thousands of Years were, as I have proved from *Alexander Polyhistor*, who had studied the *Chaldean* Antiquities, no other than *Days*; and were only used by the *Chaldeans* themselves, as the same Writer tells us, in computing the Times of the first Kings, and the first Ages. But other Writers, who studied the *Chaldean* Learning, applied them to later Times, and deduced them from different Epochs, which made the Difference observed in the Numbers of *Diodorus Siculus*, *Cicero*, and *Epigenes* from the Numbers of *Berosus*.

The *Chaldean* Priests at *Babylon* informed *Callisthenes* the Astronomer, that their astronomical Observations reached to 1903 Years before *Alexander's* Time, or his Expedition into *Asia* and Conquest of *Babylon*. This Computation was made by solar Years, by which only they reckoned; and 1903 Years to *Alexander* and the Year before *Christ* 330, when he conquered *Darius*, commenced in the Year before *Christ* 2233. This (51) Account *Callisthenes* sent from *Babylon* into *Greece*, to his Master and Uncle *Aristotle*, who had desired him to procure it; and *Porphyry* gave the Account from *Aristotle*, which *Simplicius* has preserved.

Epigenes afterwards studied amongst the *Chaldeans* their Learning, and gave an Account of their oldest celestial Observations, which he computed by Myriads after the ancient *Chaldean* Way; and found to contain a Term of 72 Myriads, or 720 thousand Years, or *Days*. These made 2000 old *Chaldean* Years of 360 Days, and are something more than 1972 *Julian* Years. *Epigenes* reckoned to his own Time, and it is uncertain when he lived. But as he is mentioned by *Pliny* before *Berosus*, both in the Place before cited, and also on another Occasion (lib. vii. c. 49.) we may suppose him to be about the same Time, and not much later. So his reckoning might be brought down to about

(51) τὰς ὑπὸ Καλλισθένης ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος πεμφθείσας ἀληθείας ἀφικέσθαι εἰς ἡμετέραν τὴν Ἀρμενίαν τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀνδρῶν, ἃς διηγεῖται ὁ Πορφύριος ὅτι χιλίων ἐτῶν εἶναι καὶ ὀκταεκαεπίων τριῶν μετὰ τὸ χρόνον Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνος ζω-
ζομένης. Simplic. Com. 46. in lib. ii. Aristot. de cœlo, p. 123.

the Year before *Christ* 260, and then it began about 2232 Years before the vulgar Christian *Æra*; and remarkably agreed with the Account of *Calisthenes*: nor is it improbable but that the *Chaldæan* Priests gave the same Account to these two studious and learned Authors: The Computation was probably deduced from the Reign of the ancient *Babylonian Belus*, whom the *Babylonians* might place in their Annals about this Time; and it will appear from the best Evidence that the Beginning of his Reign commenced in the Year before *Christ* 2233, exactly agreeable to the Account of *Callisthenes*. The preceding Accounts are older than any we have of the celestial Observations made by the *Egyptians*. And *Porphyry* saies (52) that the *Chaldæans* made Observations on the Motion of the Stars before the *Egyptians*. And *Simplicius* (53) intimates the same. But if it be true that *Osiris* and *Thoth*, or *Hermes*, made celestial Observations in *Egypt*, as *Diodorus Siculus* relates (lib. i. p. 19.) these must be as old as those of the *Chaldæans* here mentioned. *Clemens Alexandrinus* (54) saies the *Egyptians* and *Chaldæans* were the first Inventors of *Astrology*, which was always esteemed by them to be the most-divine Science.

We have Reason to believe that the *Chaldæans* had made Astronomical Observations as early as the Time above-mentioned; for *Abraham*, who was born 1072 Years after the Flood, and in the Year before *Christ* 2098, was a practical Astronomer amongst the *Chaldæans*; and taught Astronomy amongst the *Phœnicians* and *Egyptians*, as is related by ancient Writers, viz. (55) *Berosus*, *Eupolemus*, *Artapanus*, *Pbilos Judæus*, *Josephus*, the ancient Author of the *Recognitions of Clement*, *Eusebius*, and others. So that the Objection made by several learned Men to these ancient *Chaldæan* astronomical Observations, that they find none extant before the *Æra* of *Nabonassar*, is nothing to the Pur-

(52) Proc. in Timæ. Plat. p. 277.

(53) ἥκιστα δ' ἐγὼ Αἰγυπτίους ἀστρων. παρατηρήσεις ἔχειν ἐγχειραμμένας σὺν ἐλαττοσιν ἢ διχαλίοις ἐνιαυτοῖς· Βαβυλωνίους δ' ἐτι πλείοσι. Com. in Aristot. lib. de cœlo, p. 27. *Simplicius* flourished A. D. 527.

(54) Αἰγύπτιοι γὰρ πρῶτοι ἀστρολογίαν εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἐξήνεγκαν· ὁμοίως ὃ καὶ Χαλδαῖοι. Strom. lib. i. p. 361. Edit. Potter.

(55) *Josephus* has preserved a Passage of *Berosus* concerning *Abraham*, viz. μετὰ ὃ καὶ ἀκλυσμόν δεκάτῃ γενεᾷ πρὸ Χαλδαίοις τις ἦ δίκαιος ἀνὴρ καὶ μέγας καὶ τὰ ἔργα ἐμπειρῶς: Antiq. Jud. lib. i. c. vii.

pose: since we are informed from the concurrent Testimonies of ancient Writers of the greatest Repute, that astronomical Observations were very anciently made in *Chaldæa*, *Babylonia*, *Arabia*, and *Egypt*. The *Chaldæans* probably did not know how to calculate Eclipses before the *Æra* of *Nabonasar*, if so soon; which *Diodorus Siculus* (56) observes of them. But they undoubtedly took notice of them when they happened, and recorded the most remarkable of them; though not so regularly and exactly as about the *Æra* of *Nabonasar*, when they set them down to the Years of the Reigns of their Kings, and marked the Constellations or Places where they happened, and kept a Kalendar of them. And their oldest Observations on the Sun, Moon, Stars, and Planets were made only for the sake of Astrology and Divination, and to settle the Return of the Seasons and the Length of the Year. These were the celestial Observations which the *Chaldæans* and *Egyptians* made so very anciently; and to doubt of them is to doubt of the Antiquity of their Nation and Religion.

Having explained the oldest Computations of the *Chaldæans*, which hitherto have greatly perplexed and been misunderstood by all Chronologers, ancient and modern, and having shewn their Agreement with the true Scripture Chronology; I proceed to the Times of the *Chaldean* or *Babylonian* Empire after the Flood.

Berosus related, that after the Flood the Family of *Xisuthrus* or *Noah*, with those who escaped and were preserved in the Ark, first assembled together in *Chaldæa*, and built the City of *Babylon*. But

(56) οὗτις ὁ κατὰ τὸ ἥλιον ἐαλείψαντες ἀποδεικνύοντες φέρωντες ἔ τολμῶσι προλέγειν, ἔδ' ἀκριβῶς ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ἀγγεῖλαι σὺν χρόνῳ. lib. i. p. 143. Edit. Wesseling. But yet *Diodorus* saies, that the *Chaldæans* had made long and accurate Observations on the Motions and Influences of the Stars, and drawn astrological Predictions from them. ἔ δ' αἰέρων πολυχρόνως ἀστροληρίσεις πεποιημένοι καὶ τὰς ἐκάστης κινήσεις τε καὶ δυνάμεις ἀκριβέστατα πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐπεγνωότες, καὶ τὴν μετέωρον συμβαίνειν προλέγουσι πῶς ἀνθρώποις. Ibid. p. 145. And *Hipparchus* related, that they calculated and set down the entire Revolutions and Periods of the seven Planets. This *Jamblicus* tells from him, as *Proclus* writes, Com. in Timæ. Plat. p. 31. And *Syncellus* saies, that from the Reign of *Nabonasar*, the *Chaldæans* were arrived to a more perfect Knowledge of the Motion of the Stars, which they communicated to the Greeks. Chronog. p. 207.

the

the Account of *Moses* is more particular and full. He tells us; that after the Flood, when *the whole Earth was of one Language, and of one Speech*; it came to pass as they journeyed from the East (from the (57) North-east parts of *Armenia*, where the Ark rested) they found a Plain in the Land of (58) *Shinar* (afterwards *Babylonia*) and they dwelt there. And they said one to another, Go to, let us make Brick, and burn them thoroughly. And they had Brick for Stone, and Slime [or (59) Bitumen] for Mortar. And they said, Let us build us a

(57) Though all the Ancients agree that the Ark rested on one of the Mountains of the *Greater Armenia*; yet the journeying of the Descendants of *Noah* to *Shinar*, being related by *Moses* to be from the East, agrees not to *Armenia*, which lay chiefly North of *Shinar*, or *Babylonia*. But it may be said that after the Flood *Noah* went with his Family into the plain Country towards the East, where they lived many Years: And after the Death of *Noah* and *Sem*, they removed Westward till they came to *Shinar*. And this seems to be the Truth. And it is a vain Imagination of the learned *Goropius Becanus* (who is followed by Sir *Walter Raleigh*, Hist. of the World, B. i. c. 7. p. 107.) that the Ark rested on one of the Mountains of *Taurus* or *Caucasus*, upon the Borders of *India*, called *Paropanifus*, or *Paropamisus*. *Indoschyth*: p. 477, 478.

(58) *Hestæus Milesius*, an ancient Writer of *Phœnician* History, places *Sennaar*, or *Shinaar*, in *Babylonia*. *Jos. Antiq. Jud. lib. i. c. 4. fin.* And *Singara* in *Mesopotamia*, which is the same Name (the Vowel *y* being sometimes pronounced and wrote in Greek *A*, and sometimes *G*, as in *Segor*, *Gaza*, and *Gomorrhah*, in which Words the aspirate Letter *y Aijn* is a *G*) is found in *Pliny*, *Ammianus Marcellinus*, *Eutropius*, and others. *Ptolemy* places both the City and Mountain of *Singara*, in the Part of *Mesopotamia* wherein is *Babylonia*. *Geog. p. 142, 143.* And *Shinar* may probably be the Country a part of which is called *Senjar* by the *Arabian* Writers. *Shinar*, or *Senaar* is rendered *Babylon* by the *Greek* Interpreters, *Zach. v. 11.* and *Babylonia*, *Esai. xi. 11.* and it could be no other, because *Babel* or *Babylon* was in the Land of *Shinar* as here related, and also *Gen. x. 10.* and *Nabuchadnezzar* King of *Babylon*, was King of *Shinar*, *Dan. i. 2.*

(59) So *Josephus* understands it, and renders the *Hebrew* Word by *Asphaltis*, *Antiq. Jud. lib. i. c. 4.* This was a pitchy Matter brought down a small River called *Is*, which ran into the *Euphrates*, and carried along with its Waters many Lumps of Bitumen, which were brought thence to the Walls of *Babylon*, as *Herodotus* relates, *lib. i. c. 179.* And *Diodorus Siculus* tells us that the Quantities of Bitumen in *Babylonia* is so great, that it not only sufficeth the Inhabitants for their Buildings; but that they also gather it in Heaps, and after it is dried use it for Fuel and burn it instead of Wood. *lib. ii. p. 126. Edit. Wesseling.* These Springs of Bitumen are

City and a Tower, whose Top may reach unto Heaven; and let us make a Name; lest we be scattered abroad upon the Face of the whole Earth.
Gen. xi. 1—4.

This Tower is related by the Ancients to have been 600 Feet (60) or a Furlong in height. But the Design which the Descendants of *Noah* had in building this City and Tower has not been rightly understood, either by the ancient or most of the modern Writers.

Josephus (61), whom many of the moderns follow, thought they built it as a Place of Security against a future Deluge. But as there is not any ground to suppose this from the Text, so it cannot with any Reason be thought to have been their Design: because they knew that God had promised *Noah* and his Sons, their Progenitors, that the Earth should not be any more destroyed by a Flood, *Gen. ix. 15.* And besides, a mountainous Country would have been a better Security against a Flood, if they had been afraid of that, than this high Tower in such a low and (62) flat Country as it was built in. Others have fancied, because they are said to have built the City and Tower *to make them a Name*, that knowing they were soon to be separated and dispersed into different Parts of the Earth, they had a mind to erect a mighty and lofty Tower to perpetuate their Names after their Dispersion. The *Greek* Translation favours this Sense by rendering the Words, *Let us make us a Name before we be scattered abroad upon the Face of the whole Earth.* The *Latin* Vulgate and *Jerome* agree with the *Greek*: but the *Arabic* Translation, taken from the *Greek*, has it, *lest we be scattered*, in Agreement with the *Hebrew* and *Sama-*

mentioned by other Authors. See *Univ. Hist.* B. i. c. 2. p. 144, 145. in the Notes. And *Arrian*, after *Herodotus*, relates that the Temple of *Belus*, in the midst of the City of *Babylon*, was built with Bricks cemented with Asphaltis or Bitumen, *De Exped. Alex.* lib. vii. and *Strab. Geog.* lib. xvi. p. 1073. and *Diod. Sic.* lib. ii. p. 120. 123.

(60) *Strabo* saies it was a Stadium or 600 Feet in height: and every Side of the Base the same. *Geog.* lib. xvi. p. 1073. See also *Herodot.* lib. i. cap. 181. and *Diod. Sic.* lib. ii. p. 123. The City and Temple are described by *Prædeux*, in his *Historical Connection*, B. ii. p. 133—144. and in the *Universal History*, B. i. c. 2. p. 144—149.

(61) *Antiq. Jud.* lib. i. c. 4.

(62) See *Herodot.* lib. i. c. 178. and *Diod. Sic.* and *Strabo* cited above.

ritan

ritan Texts and with the *Chaldee* Paraphrase and *Syriac* Version. And this is undoubtedly the true Sense of the Words.

There is then no Reason to think, these first Inhabitants of the new World, who were plain simple Men, were so ambitious as to spend several Years in building a City and a Tower, which they expected soon to leave, only as a Monument to their Posterity of their Folly and Vanity. Their Design therefore in building the City, was undoubtedly that they might live together in it, not intending to separate from one another: they built it for an Habitation for themselves and Families. And they built the Tower as high as they could, *lest they should be scattered abroad*, or be lost and bewildered. Therefore they built it, that it might be for a *Land-mark* or *Signal*, to know thereby their Way home, when at any Time they should be at a great Distance from the City, either feeding their Flocks and Cattle, or in hunting wild Beasts; and so to prevent their wandering and being lost in the Desarts of that wide, plain, and open Country, where there was yet no Road: and where losing their Way, they would either perish by Famine or wild Beasts. This is the true Meaning of the Word rendered *Name*, which signifies a *Sign*, *Signal*, *Index*, or *Monument*, as *Perizonius* (63) has abundantly and learnedly proved. It was for the same Reason that King *Uzziab* built Towers in the Desert — *because he had much Cattle both in the low Country, and in the Plain*, 2 Chron. xxvi. § 10. Therefore he built them for a Direction to his Shepherds and Herdsmen, to find their Way home when at a Distance from their Habitation. So this is the true Meaning of the Expression, *making a Name*, or, as it would have been better rendered, making a *Sign* or *Land-mark*.

But God, who saw it was best that the several Families of the Sons of *Noah* should not continue in one Place, and that they should be separated and dispersed, in order to the peopling and cultivating the other

(63) Orig. Babylon. c. xii. the Word [שֵׁם] *Sem* has this Sense in *Esai.* c. lv. last Verse; where it is explained by [אֵימָנָה] *a Sign*: viz. *for a Name*, that is, *for a perpetual Sign*. And in ch. lvi. § 5. *Jed a Hand, Statue, Index, or Monument*, and *Sem, a Name*, are synonymous. And the Word *Sema* [σημα] *a Sign*, in the *Greek* Language, is plainly derived from the *Hebrew Sem*, and shews the original Signification of it.

Parts of the habitable Earth, disappointed their Design in a miraculous Manner by *confounding their Language, so that they could not understand one another's Speech.* § 7. Their Language being (64) broken partly

(64) The *Hebrew, Canaanitish or Phœnician*, and the *Chaldee, Syrian, Arabian, Egyptian, and Æthiopian* Languages, were only different Dialects of the same Language, and continued many Ages to have a near Affinity to each other. The *Greek* Language was partly *Phœnician*, and partly the Language which *Javan, Elifba*, or their Descendants of the Family of *Japhet*, carried first into the *Greek* Countries; and which was originally the same with the *Cimbric, Getic, Scythic, Teutonic*, or old *Anglo-Saxon*; and the *Roman* or *Latin* Language was derived from the Mixture of these. See *Mer. Casaub. De vet. ling. Anglic. five Saxon.* And *Goropius Becanus, Meric Casaubon, Somner, Cambden*, and others, have abundantly shewn, that the old *English* or *Saxon* Language has a great Affinity with the *Cimbric* or *Teutonic*, in which there are a great many *Greek* Words, or such as are derived from *Greek* Words, which yet cannot be deduced from the *Hebrew* or *Phœnician* Tongues; but which are probably derived from the *Japhetic* or *Javanic* Language, which was the original *Greek* before the *Phœnician* was mixed with it: and so 'tis no Wonder that many Words are plainly *Greek*, which can no Way be deduced from the *Hebrew*, but were probably the original *Javanic* or *Cimbric*, which made a Part of the *Greek* Language, and was the primitive *Greek*.

Those Families who went into the Eastern and North-East Parts, had peculiar Dialects, and some of them almost new Languages, as appears chiefly from the Language of the *Chinese, Mongul-Tartars, and Indians*: though the Language of the last was soon mixed with *Egyptian* and *Arabian* Words, there being very early an Intercourse amongst these Nations. The *Median* and *Persian* Languages, though originally at the Dispersion distinct from the *Canaanitish* and *Japhetic* Dialects or Tongues, became greatly mixed afterwards with the latter, by the Incurfions and Settlements of the *Scythians* in those Countries: and so it is no Wonder that many *Scythic* or *Japhetic Greek* Words should be found in the *Persian* and *Median* Language. The *Phrygian* and *Armenian* Language was originally *Japhetic* also. That which made all these Languages appear so different in after Times, as to be thought distinct original Languages, was the Encrease of People, and with them the Encrease of Names of Things useful or necessary in Life; also daily new Observations, Invention and Improvements of various Arts and Sciences, and commercial Dealings with those of different Nations, and mutual Settlements amongst one another: likewise different Pronunciations of the same Words, and Change of Letters in them, produced in Appearance infinite different Words. It seems an unnecessary Question to ask which was the first, or original Language: for it is probable that it never existed any where after the Confusion of the one universal Language at *Babel*; but all the several Dia-

into.

into *different Dialects*, and partly into various new Words, and Forms of speaking, understood by none but those who used them, they were not able any longer to go on with their Work, but were forced to leave off their Building before they had finished it, *ŷ* 8. And perceiving by

lects and Tongues, into which it was divided, partook of it. The *Hebrew*, *Phœnician*, or *Canaanitish* Language, might possibly be the original Language of *Adam*, and of the Antediluvian Patriarchs; and the *Chaldean*, *Syrian*, *Æthiopian*, *Egyptian*, and *Arabian* Tongues may be originally only different Dialects of it. And if the Antediluvian Names, and those of *Noah's* Family after the Flood, and of Places, Rivers, Mountains, *etc.* till the Time of the Confusion and Division of Tongues were purely *Hebrew*, we may reasonably conclude that more of the original Language of Mankind (if not the whole) was preserved in the *Hebrew* than in any other Language. Another, and principal Argument of which is, that those who were skilled in many Languages, have observed that the *Hebrew* is more or less diffused through all of them, and has many more Words remaining amongst them than any other Language is known to have. As *Abraham* brought the *Chaldean* Language with him into *Canaan*, he would infuse and propagate it more or less in that Country, whereby many *Chaldean* Words would be mixed with the Language of *Canaan*: and likewise, as the *Egyptian* Language was become so different from the *Hebrew*, when the Sons of *Jacob* went down into *Egypt* to buy Corn, that *Joseph* spake to them by an Interpreter; and it is called with Respect to the *Hebrew* a *strange* or *foreign Language*, *Psal.* lxxxi *ŷ* 5. cxiv. *ŷ* 1. the *Jews* by conversing with the *Egyptians* many Years, and afterwards when they became Servants to them, must of course learn somewhat of their Language, which would cause it to be mixed with their own; and *Moses* was taught the *Egyptian* Language from his Infancy; so that the *Hebrew* Language had probably a Mixture both of *Chaldean* and *Egyptian* in it. The Opinion of Rabbi *Elias Ascenazus*, cited by *Kircher*, is worth Notice. He saies that the *Cha'dee* Language, in the Time of *Abraham*, was the pure and uncorrupt original *Hebrew* Language; and that the *Chaldee*, so called in Distinction to the *Hebrew*, was a Corruption of the *Hebrew* after the Departure of *Abraham* from *Chaldæa* into the Land of *Canaan*, where the true original *Hebrew* was preserved. And in Favour of this Opinion, we find that when *Abraham* came into the Land of *Canaan* he was able to converse with the Inhabitants without an Interpreter: as if their Language was either wholly or very nearly the same: *Quæri igitur posset, quando lingua Hebræa, et anteporibus patrum hæc lingua fuerit usitata? — videtur mihi conveniens dicere quod adulterata sit postquam egressus est Abrahamus inde — et ingrediente Abrahamo in terram Canaan, sequebatur is et omnes servi ejus sermonem Cananæam, quæ fuit lingua sancta simpliciter. Oedip. Egypt. Vol. I. Tom. 2. p. 54. See Walton's Prolegom iii. ad Bibl. Polyglot Sect. iii. — xx.*

this extraordinary Act of divine Providence, that what they designed was contrary to God's Will, and that he had determined *to scatter them abroad on the Face of all the Earth*, they dispersed themselves into different Parts of the World, *after their Families, and after their Tongues*. By which Means the several Parts of the Earth became peopled by Degrees, and regularly by distinct Families, without War or Violence towards one another: which otherwise must have happened as soon as that Part of the Country wherein they all lived together, became too strait for them; when the most numerous and potent Families would have driven out the rest. The City was called *Babel* from the *Confusion* of Language, and by the *Greeks Babylon*.

Josepbus (65) cites the ancient *Sibylline* Writings which mention the building of this Tower, and the Confusion of Language; and which add, that God by a tempestuous Wind overthrew it. And it appears to have been a very ancient Tradition amongst the *Jews* and eastern Nations, that the Tower of *Babel* was blown down by a divine or miraculous Wind. The ancient *Chaldean* Records, whence the *Sibylline* Verses were derived, are an Attestation to the Account of *Moses* concerning the building the City and Tower of *Babylon*, and the Confusion and Division of Tongues which then happened: but as *Moses* says nothing of the Tower being blown down, and only relates that the People, when their Language was confounded, and they could not understand one an-

(65) *Antiq. Jud. lib. i. c. 4. Alexander Polybistor* cited before him the same Sibyl for the same Account. *Apud Cyril. Alex. cont. Jul. lib. i. p. 9. and in Syncellus p. 44. And Abydenus*, from the *Chaldean* Records, saies the Gods overthrew the Tower, where *Babylon* was, with a Wind, *Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ix. c. 14. and in Cyril above, and in Syncel. p. 44. Moses Chorenensis*, from *Maribas Catinensis*, gives a like Relation, *Hist. Armen. lib. i. c. 8. p. 24. And the Sibyl* is also cited in *Theophilus*, the ancient Bishop of *Antioch*, *ad Autolyc. lib. ii. p. 107. This was the Berosian Sibyl*, or her supposed to be the Daughter of *Berosus*, mentioned by *Pausanias*, in *Phoc. p. 828. and by Suidas, voc. Σεβύλλη. See the Verses in Gallæus's Edition of the Sibylline Oracles, p. 336, 344. She is also cited by Moses Chorenensis lib. i. p. 16. And these ancient Sibylline Verses were originally the Relation of the ancient Chaldean Records concerning the Tower of Babel or Babylon.*

other

other, *left off to build the City and the Tower.* (66) *Gen. xi. v. 8.* this was probably all that happened; and had the Tower been overthrown by a Tempest, we may reasonably believe that *Moses* would not have omitted the Mention of so extraordinary an Event. The Tower being left unfinished by the first Builders, gave Occasion, as is probable, to the Story of its being overthrown and demolished by a miraculous Wind sent from God.

After the Confusion and Division of the Language of the Posterity of *Noah*, and their Dispersion according to their several Tongues and Families, *Moses* tells us, ch. x. how the Earth was divided amongst them. *Nimrod* was the youngest Son of *Cush*, who was the Son of *Ham*; and is by the ancient (67) *Jews* and *Christians* thought to have been the chief Promoter of the building of the City and Tower of *Babel*. This might be inferred from what is said of him, v. 8, 9, 10. where he is called *a mighty one in the Earth*; also *a mighty Hunter*, famous even to a Proverb. And, as I observed above, the high Tower of *Babel* was a very useful Mark for Hunters to prevent their being lost in the Deserts and wide Plains of *Shinar*, when the Pursuit of their Game carried them to a great Distance from the City.

Upon the Dispersion of the other Families, *Nimrod* chose *Babel* for the Settlement of his Family, and there fixed the Seat of his Kingdom; and built three other Cities in the Land of *Shinar*, called *Erech*, *Accad*, and *Calne*, or *Calane*, ch. x. v. 10. *Erech* was a City of *Chaldæa*, which *Scaliger* (68) thinks was called by the *Greeks*, *Orchoe*: the Septuagint call it *Orech*: from whence the *Arabians* call *Chaldæa* adjoining to *Arabia*, by the Name of (69) *Yrac*, *Irac*, or *Erac*. And this is more probable than that it was the *Arecca* of *Ptolemy*, or *Arecha* of (70) *Am-
mianus Marcellinus*, who placeth it in *Susana*. For it is said to be in the Land of *Shinar*, which comprehended only the Countries of *Baby-*

(66) The *Jewish Hebrew* Copy has omitted the Words, *and the Tower*, which are preserved in the *Samaritan Hebrew* Copy, and in the *Greek* Version, and ought to be added to the Text.

(67) *Joseph. Antiq. Jud. lib. i. c. 4.*

(68) *Fragment. ad fin. Emendat. Tempor. Ptolemy* places it in *Babylonia*, or *Chaldæa* near to the Desert of *Arabia*.

(69) *Hyd. Not. ad Peritfol. Itiner. Mundi p. 65.*

(70) *Hist. lib. xxiii.*

Imia and *Chaldæa*. The second City *Accad*, or as the Greek Version has it, *Archad*, seems to be the City *Argad* in *Sittacene*, which (71) *Strabo* says was a Part of *Babylonia*: and the River *Argad* so called from the City, is mentioned by *Ælian* from *Ctesias*. *Jerome* (72) supposes it to be *Nisibis*; but I think not so probably. The third City, *Calne*, or *Calane*, is mentioned, *Ejai*. x. § 9. and was, very probably, the Metropolis of *Chalonitis*, which was afterwards called (73) *Ctesiphon*, built upon the *Tigris*, and opposite to *Babylon*; and *Chalonitis*, in which was *Ctesiphon*, is reckoned by *Pliny*, lib. vi. c. 26. to be a Part of *Babylonia*. So that the Kingdom of *Nimrod* contained *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa*.

Moses adds, § 11. Out of that Land (of *Sbinar*) went forth *Asbur*, and builded *Nineveh*, etc. The learned (74) *Bochart* renders the Words of the Text, out of that Land He [i. e. *Nimrod*] went into *Asbur*, i. e. *Assyria*, and builded *Nineveh*, etc. So he makes *Nimrod* to have reigned both at *Babylon* and *Nineveh*. Dr. *Hyde* (75) agrees with the Interpretation of *Bochart*: and so does the Targum of *Onkelos*. And *Theophilus* (76) Bishop of *Antioch* saies, that *Nimrod* built *Nineveh*. But as all the ancients agree that *Assyria* was called from *Asbur*, and that he first inhabited that Countrey; there is no Reason to think that *Nineveh* was afterwards built by *Nimrod*. The Hebrew Text will not bear the Interpretation put upon it by *Bochart* and *Hyde*. It should, according to their Sense of it, have been not [אשור] but *Asbura*, or *Leasbur*, [לֵאשׁוּר or אֲשׁוּרָה] and the Greek, Syriac, and Latin and Arabic Versions, and the Samaritan Text, all agree with the Hebrew: and the Greek and Hebrew Reading is confirmed by *Josephus*, (77) who saies that *Asbur* built the City *Nineveh*, and that the *Assyrians* were so called

(71) *Geog.* lib. xv. p. 1064. see *Ælian*. *Hist. Animal.* lib. xvi. c. 42. and *Bochart*. *Geog. Sac.* p. 237.

(72) *Quæst. Hebraic. in Gen.*

(73) It is called *Ctesiphon* by *Jerome*, *Comment. in Amos*, c. vi. and in his *Literical Questions on Genesis*, where he saies; Chalane, quæ postea verso nomine a Seleuco rege est dicta Seleucia, vel certe quæ nunc Κτησιφών appellatur.

(74) *Geog. Sac.* p. 240.

(75) *Hist. Relig. vet. Pers.* p. 41, 42.

(76) *Ad Autolyc.* lib. ii. p. 106.

(77) *Antiq. Jud.* lib. i. c. 6.

from him. Farther, it is not probable, that the *Assyrians* should be so called from *Asbur*, if their first City and Metropolis had been built, and the Country had been in Possession, and under the Government of *Nimrod*: and as *Asbur* a *Semite*, would not choose the Land of *Nimrod* a *Chamite*, for an Habitation; so neither is it likely, that if *Asbur* was there before him, *Nimrod* would have made Settlements in the same Country, who was of a different Language, as is probable, as well as of a different Family, from the Inhabitants of it, There is not the least Reason to think, as is imagined by many learned Men, that *Nimrod* drove *Asbur* and his People from their first Settlements, and took Possession of them. There appears not yet, nor for many Years afterward, any War to have begun amongst them: and it is plain that all the Families descended from *Noah*, intended to have lived together, as long as they could, in the same Country, and in one Society, if God would have permitted them so to do. War and Bloodshed was the pernicious Effect and Consequence of Idolatry. But Idolatry was first set up in *Phœnicia* and *Egypt*; and did not prevail in *Chaldæa* till the Days of *Serug*, who was born 793 Years after the Flood, and 262 Years after the Dispersion, and 2376 Years before the vulgar Christian Æra. And then, we hear of Wars and Conquests, and Kings subduing other Kings, and bringing them under Tribute and Subjection. Moreover, *the Land of Asbur* or *Assyria*, and *the Land of Nimrod*, or *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa*, are expressly distinguished by the Prophet *Micah*, c. v. § 6. *Asbur* is there plainly a proper Name as *Nimrod* is, and their Land or Country is represented as being different from each other. And as both these Kingdoms were Enemies to the *Jewish* Nation, the King of *Assyria* first carrying ten Tribes into Captivity, and afterward the King of *Babylon* the other two Tribes, their Countries, called *the Land of Asbur*, and *the Land of Nimrod*, from their Founders and first Possessors, are each distinctly threatened *to be laid waste by the Sword*. It is not, therefore, to be doubted but that *Asbur* built *Nineveh*; and called it so from *Nin nue*, the *Habitation of his Son*, or *Ninus*, designing it for the Seat of his Family and Posterity: in like Manner as *Cain* called the City which he built

built, after the Name of his Son *Enoch*, *Gen. iv. v. 17.* *Asbur* therefore, the second Son of *Sem*, went out of *Sbinar* about the Time, or a little before *Nimrod* began to rule there; and settled with his Family in the Country lying next to his elder Brother *Elam's*, as it was natural for him to do. And having lived to build a City, for he was very old, he called it *the Habitation of his Son*, or *Nineveh*.

Lastly, another Argument that *Asbur* and not *Nimrod* was the Builder of *Nineveh*, and Founder of the *Assyrian* Kingdom, and ruled there, is, that his Name is preserved in the *Assyrian* Idol, *Aser*, *Azer*, or *Azar*, who was the *Greek Mars*, and the *Assyrian Bel*, or *Baal*, i. e. Lord; as he was also of the *Babylonians*, who were afterward subject to the *Assyrians*; and was added to the Names of the *Assyrian* and *Babylonian* Kings, viz. *Tiglatb-Pil-Eser*, *Salman-Aser*, *Nabon-Afar*, *Efar-Haddon*, or *Efar-Adon*, *Nabu-codon-Ofer*, *Nabo-Pol-Afar*, *Nabu-col-Afar*, or *Nabu-cbadnezzar*.

As the Dispersion of the Descendants of *Noah*, according to their several Languages and Families, made the Countries whither they were scattered, for a long Time thin of Inhabitants; so it is no Wonder that *Moses*, having related their first Settlements, should make no more Mention of any of them for many Years. After *Nimrod* we have no Account in Scripture of the Kings of *Sbinar*, till *Amraphel* in the Days of *Abraham*; nor after *Asbur* do we there read the Name of any King of *Nineveh* or *Assyria*, till *Pul*, who reigned many Ages after *Abraham*. Yet no doubt there was a Succession of Kings in both these Countries from *Asbur* and *Nimrod*. The *Assyrians* had not such ancient Annals as the *Chaldeans* had; and we meet in no History with an Account of their Kings before *Ninus*, who conquered *Babylon*, and made it tributary to the *Assyrian* Empire: from whose Time the *Babylonian* and *Assyrian* Kingdoms were united: and *Ninus* is reckoned by Historians the Founder of the *Assyrian* Empire.

The *Chaldeans*, as we learn from *Berosus*, preserved an Account of their Kings from the beginning: and from the Writings of *Berosus* and other *Chaldean* Historians, and from the most ancient Records kept at *Babylon* in the Temple of *Belus*, *Alexander Polyhistor*, *Abydenus*, and others wrote their Accounts of the *Chaldean* Kings. I shall

shall therefore proceed to give an Account, from the *Chaldaean Annals*, of the Succession of their Kings from the Beginning. The first recorded Kingdom after the Flood, was that of *Babylon*, which commenced soon after the Dispersion of the Posterity of *Noah* at the Birth of *Peleg*, in the Year of the World 2788, and 531 Years after the Flood, and 2638 Years before the Christian *Æra*. *Alexander Polyhistor* has not told us who was the first King, and how long he reigned, but relates from (78) *Berosus*, that *Euechous*, who was also called *Chosma-Belus*, or *Choma-Belus*, was the second King; and that seven *Chaldaean* Kings reigned 190 Years. But *Africanus*, from some other Author, if *Syncellus* himself has not enlarged the Numbers of *Africanus*, gives them near 225 Years. We know from Scripture that *Nimrod* was the first King, *Bel*, *Belus*, or Lord of *Babylon*, after the Flood; and *Berosus*, as *Alexander Polyhistor* relates, made *Euechous* the second; and therefore *Africanus* is mistaken in making *Euechous* the same with *Nimrod*, as does *Cedrenus* (79) from him: and he ought to be put in the second place, where he was in the Catalogue of *Berosus*. Making therefore this necessary Correction, the Series of the first *Chaldaean* or *Babylonian* Kings stood as follows, in *Africanus* or *Syncellus*.

Chaldaean Kings after the Flood. In Syncellus, p. 90, etc,

1. *Nimrod* (the first *Belus*) reigned in *Babylon*, after the Dispersion, 6 Years; in the Year of the World 2788, and in the Year before the Christian *Æra* 2638.
2. *Euechous*, called also (80) *Chosma-Belus*, reigned 7 Years and an half; in the Year of the World 2794, and in the Year before *Christ* 2632.

(78) Apud Syncel. p. 78.

(79) Compend. Hist. p. 9.

(80) *Chosma-Belus*, or *Chosna-Belus*: that is, *the Strength of Belus* (as being perhaps his first-born Son) or *the strong Belus*. And hence we may infer, that the most ancient *Belus* mentioned by ancient and other later Historians, especially *Eupolemus*, was *Nimrod*. And *Nimrod* was called *Belus* and *Saturn* by the *Babylonians* and had a Son called *Belus*. Βαβυλωνίαις γὰρ λέγειν πρῶτον γῆ-

3. *Porus* (81) reigned 35 Years; in the Year of the World 2801, and before *Christ* 2625.
4. *Necubus* reigned 43 Years; in the Year of the World 2836, and before *Christ* 2590.
5. *Abius* reigned 48 Years; in the Year of the World 2879; and before *Christ* 2547.

ἐξ ἧς Βῆλον ἐν ἑαυτῷ Κρόνον· ἐκ τούτου ὁ ἡμέτερος Βῆλον, etc. Eupolem. apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ix. c. 17. Nebrothem, qui est Belus. Mos. Choren. Hist. Armen. lib. i. c. 4. Ego vero quem Saturnum nominant ac Belum Nebrothem fuisse dico. Ibid. c. 6. *Artapanus*, in his *Jewish History*, written a Century or more before the Christian *Æra*, makes *Nimrod* the same with *Belus*, who, he saies, alone of the Race of Giants who inhabited *Babylonia*, and were by a divine Judgment destroyed for their Impiety, having escaped Death, dwelt at *Babylon*, in a Tower which he had built, and which was called after his Name. Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ix. c. 18. The Reigns of *Belus*, or *Nimrod*, and of *Chosma-Belus* were very short; and they were probably both very old when they began to reign: and *Nimrod* might be near 400 Years of age, as he was the Grandson of *Ham*. *Herennius Philo* of *Byblus*, the Translator of *Sanchoniatho*, made *Cush* the Father of *Nimrod* to be the first *Belus*, as if he was the *Saturn* or *Cronus*, who begot *Jupiter Belus* in *Peræa*, called afterwards *Babylonia*. For he said that *Babylon* was built by the Son of the most wise *Belus*. Ap. Steph. voc. Βαβυλων. Now as *Nimrod* was the chief Builder of *Babylon*, the first *Belus* whose Son built *Babylon*, must be *Cush*. And as *Cush* was the eldest Son of *Ham*, he might well be the *Saturn* of *Sanchoniatho*, who had the chief Authority and Rule amongst his Descendants, as is represented in *Sanchoniatho's History*; if other Parts of that History were not inconsistent with this Notion, and which suppose *Saturn* to be at least one Generation after *Cush*: for *Misraim's* Son *Taut* is older than *Saturn* in that History, and contemporary with *Nimrod*, who therefore is more likely to be the *Saturn* of *Sanchoniatho*, if *Saturn* was not the Son of *Cainan*. But this Matter will be fully considered in the *Phœnician History*. *Philo* adds, that *Belus* built *Babylon* 2000 Years before the Time of *Semiramis*, mentioned by *Herodotus*. Now *Herodotus* saies *Semiramis*, who improved the Buildings of *Babylon*, lived five Generations, or 166 Years, before *Nitocris*, Queen of *Nabuchadnezzar*, whom he calls *Sabynitus*: so *Semiramis* was probably Queen of *Nabonassar*, who began to reign in the Year before *Christ* 747, and by this reckoning *Babylon* was built by *Nimrod* in the Year before *Christ* 2747, which is too high by more than a Century.

(81) *Porus* and the seventh *Babylonian King* *Zinzirus*, or *Cinzirus*, are two Names of *Babylonian Kings* mentioned after the two first Kings of *Ptolemy's Astronomical Canon* of *Babylonian Kings*.

6. *Oniballus* reigned 40 Years; in the Year of the World 2927, and before *Christ* 2499.
7. *Zinzirus* reigned 45 Years; in the Year of the World 2967, and before *Christ* 2459.

The Sum total is 224 Years and an half. (82) *Alexander Polybistor*, from *Berosus*, reckoned this Dynasty no more than 190 Years: and therefore it ended in the Year of the World 2978, and before *Christ* 2448, and must be so reckoned.

Dynasty of six Arabian Kings, who reigned after the foregoing, over the Chaldaean Empire for 215 Years.

1. *Mardocentes* reigned 40 Years; in the Year of the World 2978, and before *Christ* 2448.
2. *Anonymus*. The Name of this King is omitted in *Syncellus's* Copy of *Africanus*: but it appears from the Times of the following Reigns and the Sum total, that the second *Arabian* King reigned 45 Years; in the Year of the World 3018, and before *Christ* 2408.
3. *Sisimardacus* reigned 28 Years; in the Year of the World 3063, and before *Christ* 2363.
4. *Nabius* reigned 37 Years; in the Year of the World 3091, and before *Christ* 2335.
5. *Parannus* reigned 40 Years; in the Year of the World 3128, and before *Christ* 2298.
6. *Nabonnabus* reigned 25 Years; in the Year of the World 3168, and before *Christ* 2258.

So the Kingdom of *Arabians* in *Chaldæa* and *Babylonia* began in the Year of the World 2978, and in the Year before *Christ* 2448, and

(82) Z'. (i. e. γ.) Καλδαίων βασιλεῖς εἰσάγει [Ἀλέξανδρος Πολύτωρ] ἐτη κατὰ τὴν αἰώναν ἡλιακὰ εἰς. i. e. 190. Syncel. Chronograph. p. 78. Syncellus probably made this Dynasty 224 Years and a half, from *Africanus*. But the Number of *Alexander Polybistor* must be most authentic; and was that of *Berosus* taken from the *Chaldaean Annals*.

ended after 215 Years Continuance, in the Year of the World 3193, and in the Year before *Christ* 2233.

Diodorus Siculus (83) observes from *Ctesias* that the *Arabians* were a warlike and free People, and had Kings of their own in the most ancient Times; one of whom, called *Ariæus*, assisted *Ninus* in the Conquest of *Babylon*.

In the preceding Catalogue of the *Arabian* Kings we have two of the most ancient and famous *Babylonian* Gods, *Merodach*, *Marodach*, or *Mardach*, mentioned *Jerem.* l. 2. and *Nebo*, or rather *Nabo* (as *Aquila*, and *Theodotion*, and *Jerome* read it) *Eesai* xlv. i. The first of these was no other than the first *Arabian* King of *Babylon*, *Mardoc-Entes*: the second is the fourth *Arabian* King of *Babylon*, *Nabo*, with the *Greek* Termination *Nabius*. These after their Deaths were deify'd and worshiped by the *Babylonians* and *Arabians* in the Days of *Serug* (84) the Great-grand-father of *Abraham*, who lived in *Chaldæa*, and is related by the Ancients to have been the first Maker of Idols, or Pictures of Men to be worshiped: and all agree that in his Time the idolatrous Worship of dead Men began to be practised: and it appears from the Book of *Joshua*, ch. xxiv. § 2. that *Terah*, the Father of *Abraham*, was an Idolater. *Serug* was born in the Year of the World 3050, and lived 330 Years, to the Year of the World 3380; and so *Merodach*, *Nabo*, *Bel* or *Behus*, were all worshiped in his Days by the *Babylonians*, *Chaldæans*, and *Arabians*. The Names of these first idolized Kings other *Babylonian* Kings and Princes took into their Names, as *Mardocempad*, *Merodach-Baladan*,

(83) Lib. ii. init.

(84) Ἑλληνισμὸς ἀπὸ τῶ χρόνων τῷ Σερέχ ἐναρξάμενον διὰ τοὺς εἰδωλολατρείας — ποιοῦν [εἰδωλα] διὰ χρωμάτων διὰ ῥαφονίας καὶ ἀρχαῖα καὶ ἀπεικάζοντες τὰς πάλαι παρ' αὐτοῖς τελεμνύμεναι, ἢ τυραννεύειν, ἢ ἡγεμονεῖν, ἢ τινας τι δεξιότητας ἐν βίῳ μνήμης δεκτὴν ἀξίον — ἐπεὶ αὖτε ἀπὸ τῶ χρόνων τῷ Θάρα πατρὸς Ἀβραάμ καὶ δι' αἰγυπιαίων καὶ πλάτων τῶ εἰδωλολατρείας πεισάμενοι οὗτοι ἐαυτῶν προπάτορας δι' ἀπεικονισμῶν τελεμνύοντες — τεχνισάμενοι ἐκ χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου καὶ λίθου λίθου ξέοντες χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου καὶ λίθου ξέοντες τεχνισάμενοι ἐπέλεσαν [αἰγυπιαῖα.] Chron. Paschal. p. 48. See Epiphanius. Hæres. i. § 6. Suid. voc. Σερέχ. Joan. Antioch. in Excerpt. Valef. p. 778. Joan. Malelam, p. 63, 64, 65, 66. Constant. Manass. p. 21. Abul-Pharaj. Hist. Dynast. p. 12. Hyde's Hist. Relig. vet. Pers. c. 2. Marsham's Chron. p. 55, etc.

Evil-

Evil-Merodach, from the deified King *Merodach*; and *Nabuchadnezzar*, *Nabuzaradan*, *Nabonasar*, *Nabopolassar*, *Nabonidas*, and others, were called from the Idol *Nebo* or *Nabo*: so likewise *Belshazzar*, *etc.* from *Bel* or *Belus*.

Another thing to be observed, is that the fifteen Generations or Reigns of the fifteenth *Egyptian* Dynasty of *Manetho*, which was the first after the Flood, called the *Cynic Circle*, and preserved in an old (85) Chronicon, were contemporary with the two first Dynasties of *Chaldaean* and *Arabian* Kings before-mentioned. The *Cynic Circle* began in *Egypt* with *Taut*, or *Tboth*, the Son of *Misraim*, who made the first Settlement there after the Dispersion, about 553 Years after the Flood, in the Year of the World 2810, and before the Christian Æra 2616; which is 22 Years after the Beginning of the Reign of *Nimrod*; and it continued in fifteen Reigns for 395 Years, to the Year of the World 3205, and before *Christ* 2221, just 12 Years after the ending of the *Arabian* Dynasty. These two Settlements are a great Confirmation of the true Time of each other: and the *Egyptian* Settlement will be particularly and fully considered hereafter.

After the *Arabians*, *Syncellus* (86) tells us, from *Africanus*, that the *Assyrian* Kings succeeded in the *Babylonian* Empire, and thenceforth *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa* became a Part of the *Assyrian* Empire. The first King was *Belus*, who began to reign in the Year of the World 3193, and before *Christ* 2233, and *Syncellus* adds, that after him 40 Kings reigned for the Space of 1460 Years, to the Dissolution of the Empire in the Reign of *Thonos-concoleros*, called also *Sardanapalus*. And in this, he saies, the eminent Historians, (87) *Polybius*, *Diodorus*, *Cephalion*, *Castor*, *Thallus*, and others agree. This is a famous Æra which has hitherto puzzled and confounded all Chronologers, both ancient and modern, and could never yet be reconciled to the Scripture-History, and to other the best and most ancient Evidence. It will be

(85) Apud Syncel. Chronograph. p. 51.

(86) Ibid. p. 92.

(87) *Polybius* flourished in the Year before *Christ*, 164. *Thallus* and *Castor* were Contemporaries, and flourished in the Reign of *Julius Cæsar*, in the Year before *Christ*, 45. *Cephalion* flourished in the Reign of *Adrian*, about the Year of *Christ* 120, and was banished by him into *Sicily*, where he wrote his History.

therefore

therefore of great Service to Chronology and History to fix this *Æra* to its true Date or Beginning as near as may be ; and shew its Consistency with Scripture, and all other the most ancient and best attested History.

Concerning Belus and his Descendants in the Babylonian Empire.

It is not agreed amongst ancient Writers who this *Belus*, so famous in History, was, and whence he came to the *Babylonian* Empire. *Africanus*, *Eusebius*, and *Syncellus*, suppose him to be an *Affyrian*, and the Father of the *Affyrian Ninus*. But as he was not the Father of *Ninus*, as will be proved from *Abydenus* out of the *Chaldean* Records; so it is highly probable, if not certain, that he was not an *Affyrian*. *Eusebius* in the Beginning of his Chronicon, makes *Ninus* the first King and Founder of the *Affyrian* Empire, as if *Belus* was not King of *Affyria*; yet he calls him the Son of *Belus*. *Africanus* (38) on the contrary calls *Belus* the first King of *Affyria*; and saies he died in the 28th Year of *Tetrah*, which was in the Year before *Christ*, 2141. *Africanus* adds, that the Kingdom descended to his Son *Ninus*: and that the *Affyrians* call him a God [*Bel* or *Baal*, Lord,] and others, *Saturn*. But *Africanus* and *Eusebius* were both mistaken in supposing the Father of *Ninus* to be the *Belus* who reigned at *Babylon*, though he might be the *Affyrian Belus*, and have reigned at *Nineveh*: for the *Babylonian Belus* was he who recovered the *Chaldean* Kingdom from the *Arabians*; and he, and four of his Descendants, reigned successively at *Babylon*, before *Ninus* King of *Affyria* conquered the *Babylonians* and took *Babylon*, and added the *Chaldean* Kingdom to the *Affyrian* Empire. This is an important Piece of History unknown to all Chronologers.

They who took this *Belus* to be *Nimrod*, thought him an *Æthiopian*, as *Moses Chorenensis* (89) who saies, that many Chronologers were of this Opinion. The Author of the *Paschal Chronicle* was one. This was supposed from his being the Son of *Cush*, who was thought to have settled in *Æthiopia*: but the Land of *Cush*, where he or his Descen-

(88) Chron. lib. prior. p. 9.

(89) Hist. Armen. lib. i. p. 13.

dants first settled, was *Arabia*, as the learned (90) *Bochart* has fully proved.

The *Tyrians* claimed *Belus* as appears from an old Poet *Dorotheus* of *Sidon* cited by *Julius Firmicus*, who flourished in the Year of *Christ* 340. He calls (91) *old Babylon the City of the Tyrian Belus*: and the *Tyrian Belus* Son of *Saturn* was contemporary with the *Babylonian Belus*, and was, I think, the same Person who was Son of the *Phœnician Saturn*, mentioned by *Sanchoiatho*.

The *Egyptians* made the *Greeks* believe that *Belus* (92) was the Son of *Neptune* and *Libya*, and went from *Egypt* with a Colony unto *Babylon*, and fixed his Habitation near the River *Euphrates*; and instituted an Order of Priests, after the Manner of the *Egyptians*, whom he exempted from public Taxes and Offices, that they might attend only to the Study of *Astrology*, and make celestial Observations. But this *Egyptian Belus* was many Centuries later than him who reigned at *Babylon*: and *Apollodorus* (93) relates that the *Egyptian Belus* did not leave *Egypt*, but reigned there.

This *Belus* therefore, was the *Babylonian Titan King* mentioned by *Thallus*, who with his *Titans* was engaged in a War against *Jupiter* and the Gods his Allies. This War *Thallus* related to have been waged in those ancient Times when the Country called afterwards *Attica* was called (94) *AËte*: and therefore it was before the Reign of *Ogyges*: for *Ogyges*, as *Africanus* related and *Eusebius* from him, reigned in *Attica*,

(90) *Geog. Sac. lib. iv. c. 2.* But see my Dissertation on the *Æthiopian Kings* of the 25th Dynasty of *Manetho*, in the 2^d Volume of this Work.

(91) Ἀρχαίη Βαβυλῶν Τυρίη Βήλοιο πόλισμα.

(92) *Diod. Sic. lib. i. p. 32.* And *Pausanias* saies, the *Babylonian Belus* had his Name from *Belus* an *Egyptian*, the Son of *Libya*. *Messen. p. 134.*

(93) *Biblioth. lib. ii. Sect. iv. p. 72.*

(94) *Attica* was originally called *AËte* from the craggy Rocks and Mountains bordering on the Sea-Coasts of the Country. Ἀχλαὶ μὲν εἰσιν οἱ περὶ ῥαῖς τόποι ὡς ἀκροί μὲν τῇ θαλάσσῃ. *Ptol. Ascalonit. de different. voc. apud Fabric. Biblioth. Gr. Tom. iv. p. 516.* and this agrees to *Strabo's* Explication of the Name. Διὰ δὲ τὸτο ἡ Ἀχλὴν φασὶ λεχθῆναι το παλαιὸν ἢ Ἀχλικὴν ἢ συῶ Ἀτλικὴν παρ-ωνομαθῆσαν, ὅτι τοῖς ὄρεσιν ὑπεπέπλωκε τὸ πλεῖστον μέρος αὐτῆς ἀλιτενὲς ἢ σεύον. *Geog. lib. ix. p. 599, 600.* And *A. Gellius* saies, *Attica* appellata fuit Ἀχλὴ, *Noët. Attic. lib. xiv. c. 6.* And *Pliny* saies, *Attica*, antiquitus *AËte* vocata. *Nat. Hist.*

which

which was (95) anciently called *AËa*. *Tballus* placed *Belus* and the Titanian War 322 Years before the *Trojan War*, according to the present Number in *Theophilus* (96) Bishop of *Antioch*, and *Lactantius* has the same Number from him, which is undoubtedly corrupt; and was probably wrote, not as we now read it 322 [TKB] but [AKB] 1022. By which Reckoning this War of *Belus* will be carried to the Year before *Christ* 2205, which was the 29th Year of his Reign. This must be so, or else *Tballus* confounded the Time of the *Babylonian Belus*, with that of the *Egyptian Belus*, who was said to be the Son of *Neptune* and *Libya*; and who lived about the Year before *Christ* 1505, or a few Years before.

Belus, after many Wars with the neighbouring Princes called (97) *Gyants*, and having subdued most of them, was opposed by *Haic* the Giant-king of *Armenia*, and, after a bloody Engagement, was slain in Battle with most of his Titans, as *Moses Chorenensis* relates from (98) *Meribas* of *Catina*. And this was the first Titanian and Giant-war in *Asia*, so much celebrated by the ancient (99) *Greek* and

lib. iv. c. 7. and Harpocrat. in voce, Ἀττικὴ Περὶ θαλάσσης τις μοῖρα ἢ Ἀττικῆς. whence *Attica* was called *AËte*, as lying along the Sea Coasts. *Hesychius* calls Ἀττικῆς, περὶ θάλασσης τόπος. and Ἀττικῆς, ὁ αἰγυιαλὸς καὶ ὁ περὶ θαλάσσης τόπος.

(95) Chron. lib. prior p. 12. and poster. p. 66.

(96) Ad Autol. lib. iii. p. 139. edit. Colon. 1686. Lact. Institut. lib. i. c. 23. As many Numbers in *Theophilus* are evidently corrupt, so the Number TKB, is undoubtedly one that is so. For by this Reckoning the *Babylonian Belus* lived about 275 Years after *Ogyges*, in whose Reign *Attica* was not called *AËa*, but *Attica*: whereas in the Reign of *Belus*, *Tballus* said it was called by its more ancient Name *AËa*. And the King who then reigned was called *Gygus* or *Gug*, and was probably of the *Japbetic* Race.

(97) They were called *Gyants*, or *Napbelim*, not from their Stature, but from their violent and oppressive Tyranny. But *Abydenus* saies they were thought to be stronger, and of a larger Size than other Men. Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ix. c. 14.

(98) Hist. Armen. lib. i. c. 9, 10.

(99) *Diodorus Siculus* relates that *Melampus* the Poet, who flourished in the Reign of *Prætus* King of *Argos*, about the Year before *Christ* 1350. brought out of *Egypt* the *History of Saturn and of the Wars of the Titans*, lib. i. p. 109. See, for the Time of *Melampus*, Apollod. lib. ii. p. 79. Now these Wars, which were really and originally waged by the *Chaldean*, *Egyptian*, *Phœnician*, and other *Asiatic* Heroes called *Titans* and *Giants*, the

Latin

Latin Writers, and derived from Eastern Authors: and the Times of the Giants and *Titans*, and their Wars in *Egypt*, *Libya*, and *Arabia*, with *Jupiter* the Father of *Osiris*, called *Ammon*, and also with *Osiris*; and in *Asia* in the Reign of the *Babylonian Belus*, agree exactly together. And hence we may with Probability conclude that these were the most ancient Wars of the *Titans* and Giants after the Flood: and we can nearly fix the Time of them. These *Titans* were of *Ham's* Line, and Descendants of *Saturn's* Daughters called *Titanidæ*, according to the most ancient History of *Sanchoniatho*; and the Giants were Descendants of *Nimrod*: though all powerful Princes in those Days were styled either the one or the other: but their Wars could not be so old as *Nimrod*. And *Eusebius*, the *Clementine Recognitions*, *Moses Chorenensis*, and many other Christian Writers are mistaken in making them commence upon the Dispersion of the Descendants of *Noah*.

The *Berosian* Sibyl, whose Oracles were derived from the *Chaldaean* Records, which were both the most ancient and authentic accounts of the Eastern History, saies the *Titanic* War was in the (1) *tenth Generation after the Flood*: and that it was the *the first War that was waged amongst Men*. *Moses* mentions not any War ensuing upon the Dispersion of Mankind after the Flood; but that they separated themselves into different Countries, *after their Families, and after their Tongues*: nor is it probable that any War commenced till many Years afterward. But as Mankind multiplied, and either thought they had not room enough, or liked the neighbouring Countries better than their own, they endeavoured to displace each other; and by Wars invaded and seized the Territories wherein others were settled: and these Wars began and were waged in *Babylonia*, *Phœnicia*, and the neigh-

Greeks ascribed to the far later times of their *Saturn* and *Jupiter*; and did not know the true Time of them.

(1) Καὶ τότε δὴ δεκάτῃ γυνὴ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων

Ἐξ ἧπερ καὶ ἀκλυσμός ἐπὶ προτέρως γυνὴ ἀνδρός, etc.

and having related the War between *Saturn* and *Titan*, adds; αὐτὴ δ' ἐστὶ δρχὴ πολέμου πάντας βροτοῖσι. p. 343, and 350. Edit. Gallæ. Compare the Account of the *Berosian* Sibyl in *Moses Chorenensis*, lib. i. p. 16, 17. This first War, in the tenth Generation after the Flood, no way agrees to the Age of *Nimrod*, who was the third in Descent from *Noah*; but it agrees more to the Time of *Belus*, who lived in the eighth Generation after the Flood, according to the Genealogy of *Moses*.

bouring Parts, in the Reign of *Belus*; and in *Arabia* and *Egypt* in the Reign of *Jupiter Ammon* and his Son *Osiris*; and from about 400 Years after the Dispersion till a Century after.

The ancient Historians generally agree that *Belus* built *Babylon*; or enlarged it, and encompassed it with Walls. (2) *Abydenus* saies that *Belus* caused the Country about *Babylon*, which was drowned and covered with Water, to be drained; and built a Wall about the City. (3) *Quintus Curtius* saies, most believed *Belus*, and not *Semiramis*, to be the builder of *Babylon*. *Ammianus Marcellinus* (4) calls him the most ancient King *Belus*, who built the Tower of *Babylon*. This Tower was first begun to be built by *Nimrod* and the Descendants of *Noah*, before their Dispersion, who were forced to leave it unfinished; and so it continued till the Reign of *Belus*, who finished this great Work, and was buried in it. The *Babylonians* used it for an Observatory, from whence they made the first celestial Observations, which the (5) *Chaldeans* ascribed to *Belus*, and made him the Inventor of astrological Science. And it appears that the most ancient celestial Observations were made at *Babylon* about the Time of *Belus*. For *Callisthenes* sent to *Aristotle*, from *Babylon*, Observations which, *Porphry* saies, contained the Term of 1903 Years before *Alexander's* Conquest of *Asia* and *Babylon*, in the Year before *Christ* 330: so they began in the Year before *Christ* 2233, in the first Year of the Reign of *Belus* (6). This

(2) Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ix. c. 41.

(3) Lib. v. c. 4.

(4) Arcem [Babylonis] antiquissimus rex condidit *Belus*. lib. xxiii. p. 371. In this Tower, which was the Temple of *Belus*, he was buried, and afterward worshiped as the chief *Babylonian* God. See Strabo Geog. lib. xvi. p. 1073. *Ælian*. Var. hist. lib. xiii. c. 3. *Arrian*. Exped. Alex. lib. iii. p. 196.

(5) Χαλδαῖοι εἰς ἐαυτοὺς μετὰ γένεσιν [τῆς ἐμπειρίας ἢ ὕψους] Βήλω τῶν ἄρρεσιν ἀνατίθεντες. *Achil. Tat* ad *Arati Phænomen.* apud *Petav.* Uranolog. p. 121. *Pliny* saies, Durat adhuc ibi [Babylone] Jovis Beli templum. inventor hic fuit fœderalis scientiæ. *Nat. Hist.* lib. vi. c. 26. *Solin.* c. lvi.

(6) It is probable that celestial Observations were now made by the *Babylonians* and *Arabians*, both for religious and civil Uses. We find in the most ancient Book of *Job*, that in his Time, which was probably 1740 Years before the Christian *Æra*, the *Arabians* had made Observations on the Stars, and ranged them into several Constellations, and had given Names to them; which shews that Astronomy was then formed into a System, how imperfect soever; and had been studied long before.

is a most remarkable Coincidence of the first celestial Observations at *Babylon* with the first Year of *Belus*, to whom they are ascribed by the ancient *Chaldæans*; and is a great Confirmation that the Reign of *Belus* is rightly fixed; and that the Term of the first *Chaldæan* Dynasty after the Flood, from *Nimrod*, was exactly 190 Years and no more, as *Alexander Polyhistor* related from *Berosus*: and so it is a very strong and valuable Attestation to the Truth of my Chronology.

Castor (7) wrote a Chronicle of the *Assyrian* Kings, which began with *Belus*; but as he was not certain of the Years of his Reign, he only set down his Name, and formed the Epoch of his Chronology from *Ninus* his Son.

Diodorus Siculus (8) relates, that *Ninus* was the first King of *Assyria* whose Actions were recorded, and thought worthy of being written; and therefore *Ctesias* began his History of the *Assyrian* Empire from this first famous King. But *Diodorus* was very negligent in omitting both the Names of all the Kings, except five; viz. *Ninus*, *Semiramis*, *Ninyas*, *Teutamus*, and *Sardanapalus*; and not setting down the Years of any of their Reigns but that of *Semiramis*. However, he has told us the entire Term of the *Assyrian* Empire from *Ninus*, and the Number of Reigns; and has mentioned a Fact, by which we can very nearly fix the *Æra* not only from *Ninus*, but also from *Belus* his Father.

Diodorus (9) relates from *Ctesias*, that *Teutamus* the 26th King of

(7) Apud Syncel. p. 206.

(8) Lib. ii. init. and p. 136.

(9) Τούταμος βασιλεύοντι τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, ὅς ἐστιν εἰκοστὸς [so the present Copies have it; but *Syncellus* citing the Passage has it κέ the 26th rightly] ἀπὸ Νίνυς [so 2 MSS. have it and *Syncellus* and *Africanus* so read it, the printed Copies have Νινύς] τῇ Σεμιράμιδος Φασι τὰς μετ' Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἑλλήνας ἐπὶ Τροίαν στρατεύσαι, ἥ ἡγεμονίαν ἔχοντων τῇ Ἀσίᾳ τῇ Ασσυρίᾳ ἔτη πλείω τῷ χιλίῳ. ἣ τὸ μὲν Περίαμον βασιλεύοντα τῇ Τρωάδι, ὑπήκουον δ' ὅληα τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν Ασσυρίων πέμψαι πρὸς αὐτὸν πρεσβυτάς περὶ βοηθείας. τὸ δὲ Τούταμον μυρίους μὲν Αἰθίοπας [i. e. *Arabians*, who are called *Æthiopians* by ancient Writers] ἄλλους δὲ τοσούτους Σασιάνους σὺν ἄξιμασι Λακκοίοις ἐξαποστείλαι στρατηγὸν καλεσθέντα Μέμνονα τὸν Τιθώνος· ἣ τὸ μὲν Τιθωνοῦ κατ' ἐκείνους χρόνους ὅληα στρατηγὸν τῇ Περσίδι &c. lib. ii. p. 136. Edit. *Wesseling*. *Plato* says the *Assyrians* assisted the *Trojans* against the *Greeks*, lib. iii. de Leg. p. 685. Edit. *Serran*. And that the *Trojans* being subject to the *Assyrians*,

Assyria from *Ninus*, the Husband of *Semiramis*, sent *Memnon* Son of *Titbonus* who was Satrapa or President of *Persia*, with an Army of ten thousand *Arabians*, and as many *Susians*, and two hundred Chariots, to assist the *Trojans* who were tributary to the *Assyrians*, in their War with the *Greeks*: and that the *Assyrians* had then ruled in *Asia* for more than a thousand Years. The War of *Troy* ended in the Year before *Christ* 1182 or 1183, by the best Accounts; and so the *Assyrian* Empire must have begun, according to *Ctesias*, somewhat before the Year before *Christ* 2182 or 2183, when *Belus* reigned: for *Ctesias* does not say it was more than a thousand Years from *Ninus*. *Ctesias* also related that the *Assyrian* Empire had continued more than 1300 Years in a Succession of 35 Kings after *Ninus*, to the Destruction of it by the *Medes* and *Babylonians*. All the present Copies of *Diodorus* reckon no more than 30 Kings or Generations from *Ninus* to *Sardanapalus*, and so with *Semiramis* only 31 Reigns. And the Term of the *Assyrian* Empire is computed to be more than 1360 Years in one (10)

and relying on their Assistance, occasioned their carrying on the War at *Troy*, against the *Greeks*.

(10) Οἱ λοιποὶ βασιλεῖς πάντες πατρὸς Δαδελχόμου ἢ ἀρχὴν ἐπὶ γενεᾶς τριάκοντα ἐβασίλευσαν μέχρι Σαρδαναπάλη, ἐπὶ ταῦτα γὰρ ἡ τῶν Ασσυρίων ἡγεμονία μετέπεσεν εἰς Μήδους ἔτη Δαμείνασα πλείω ἢ χιλίων ἢ τετρακοσίων, ἔτι δὲ ἐξήκοντα, καθάπερ φησὶ Κτησίας ὁ Κνίδιου ἐν τῇ δαυτέρᾳ βίβλῳ. lib. ii. p. 135. That the Words ἔτι δὲ ἐξήκοντα are an Interpolation is plain from another Passage where they are left out, viz. ἡ μὲν δὲ ἡγεμονία ἢ Ασσυρίων ἀπὸ Νίνε Δαμείνασα μὲν τριάκοντα γενεάς, ἔτη δὲ πλείω ἢ χιλίων ἢ τετρακοσίων ὑπὸ Μήδων κατελύθη. p. 142. The Reading here of most of the Copies is τετρακοσίων, i. e. 400. but two Copies have τετρακοσίῃ, i. e. 300. as the first cited Passage has it, and which is undoubtedly the true Number. *Syncellus* cites the Words of *Diodorus* rightly both as to the Number of Reigns, and Years of the *Assyrian* Empire, viz. Οἱ λοιποὶ βασιλεῖς πάντες πατρὸς Δαδελχόμου ἢ ἀρχὴν ἐβασίλευσαν ἐπὶ γενεᾶς, ME [i. e. 45. but it should be AE i. e. 35. as it follows presently after] μέχρι Σαρδαναπάλη· ἐπὶ ταῦτα γὰρ ἡ τῶν Ασσυρίων ἡγεμονία μετέπεσεν εἰς Μήδους ἔτη Δαμείνασα πλείω τῶν α'. ἢ τ' [i. e. 1300] καθάπερ φησὶ Κτησίας ὁ Κνίδιου ἐν τῇ β' βίβλῳ. — ὁ Διόδωρος ἡμῖν παραδίδωσιν — μὲν ὅτι πλείω τῶν α' [1300] ἐτῶν ὁ χρόνος τῶν ἀπὸ Νίνε, λέ' [i. e. 35.] βασιλείων ἐστίν. Καὶ ὅτι τὴν Τροίαν ἀλάσιν ἐπὶ τῷ κς' [i. e. 26.] ἀπὸ Νίνε βασιλεύσαντος Ασσυρίων φησὶ γενέσθαι μετὰ α' ἔτη ἢ πλείω. Chronograph. p. 166. In this last Place *Syncellus* ascertains three most observable Numbers from *Diodorus Siculus*, viz. that the Time of the *Assyrian* Empire was more than 1300 Years under the Reigns of 35 Kings from *Ninus*: and that *Troy* was taken in

Place, and more than 1400 Years (11) in another. But that these Numbers both of Reigns and Years are corrupt is certain. For *Eusebius*, who followed *Castor*, had 36 Reigns ; which Number he also found in *Diodorus* and *Cephalion*, as *Syncellus* (12) observes ; and also the Years to

the Reign of the 26th King from *Ninus*, more than a thousand Years after the Beginning of the *Assyrian* Kingdom in *Asia*

(11) Lib. ii. p. 142. taken Notice of above.

(12) ὁ μὲν τοι Εὐσέβιος — τὰς προκειμένας χρίσεις [leg. ῥήσεις] Διοδώρου ἢ Κεφαλίων προθεῖς ἐν λζ' [37. but *Syncellus* wrote λε' 36. which is the known Number of *Eusebius*, and was also the true Number of *Diodorus*, as I have proved.] βασιλεύσιν τὴν Ασσυρίων ἀρχὴν ἐπέλαβεν ἔτεσι δὲ αὐτ' τῷ Κάσσοι μάλλον ἀκολουθήσας, ἢ ἡ μαρτυρίαν προήγαγεν, ἀπ' [i. e. 1280.] ἔτη φάσκουσιν τὰς Ασσυρίων βασιλεῖς ἄρξαι. p. 168. *Castor* differed 20 Years, or more, from *Ctesias* ; and *Eusebius* made the Years from *Ninus* 1240, in which, if he followed *Castor*, the 1280 Years of *Castor* must be reckoned from *Belus* : But *Castor* assigned no Years to *Belus*, as he tells us in *Syncellus*, p. 206. so *Eusebius* shortened the Years both of *Ctesias* and *Castor* to suit them to his own Chronology. *Syncellus*, it must be observed, charges *Cephalion* with making no more than 23 Reigns from *Belus* to *Sardanapalus* ; making also *Tautanus*, in whose Reign *Troy* was taken, the 22^d from *Belus*, and *Sardanapalus* to succeed *Tautanus*. But no ancient Writer was ever so absurd as to talk at this Rate. The Charge of *Syncellus* is founded on a corrupted Number which he found in his Copy of *Cephalion*, who was esteemed, and *Syncellus* allows him to be, an accurate Writer. *Cephalion* related that the *Assyrian* Kings had successively reigned for a thousand Years, to the taking of *Troy* in the Reign of *Tautanus*. If any one, he adds, would know the Names of the Kings, he may read them in *Ctesias*, 23, as I think they are. Had this been the Number of *Cephalion*, there must have been 24 Kings with *Sardanapalus* : but as he reckoned the 1000 Years of the *Assyrian* Empire to the Reign of *Tautanus*, and referred to *Ctesias* for the Number of Reigns in that Interval, it is evident that he wrote κς'. i. e. 26. and not κΓ. i. e. 23. as *Syncellus* found it. For *Syncellus* knew that *Tautanus* was the 26th King of the Catalogue of *Ctesias*. *Cephalion* therefore undoubtedly reckoned 26 Kings from *Ninus* to *Tautanus*, and made *Tautanus* the 27th from *Belus*. He mentioned *Panyas* the 23^d King from *Ninus*, in whose Reign he places the *Argonaut* Expedition ; and also *Mitbræus* the 25th King, and adds, that he was succeeded by *Tautanus* the 27th King, i. e. from *Belus*. The Words in *Syncellus* are, Μηδὲν ὅ τι τὸ δόχλιον ἀφ' ἑξῆς Ταύτανος Ζ. *Syncellus* found the imperfect Number Ζ'. i. e. 7. and has left it so : but he might easily have seen that *Cephalion* wrote ΚΖ'. i. e. 27. and made *Tautanus* the 27th King from *Belus* (from whom he supposes him to reckon the 1000 Years to the taking of *Troy*) as he really was. See *Syncel. Chronograph.* p. 167,

be 1300. And *Syncellus* cites the Words of *Diodorus* in several (13) Places, where *Sardanapalus* is said to be the 35th King from *Ninus*; and the Period of the *Assyrian* Empire from *Ninus* to be something more than 1300 Years. So that the present Copies of *Diodorus* ought to be corrected by this ancient Evidence. And that *Ctesias* and *Diodorus* had no more than the Number of 1300 Years, for the Term of the *Assyrian* Empire, may farther be proved from the Account of *Pompeius Trogus* in (14) *Justin*, who saies, that the *Assyrians* ruled (in *Asia*) for the Term of 1300 Years. *Trogus* had his Account from *Diodorus Siculus*. *Velleius Paterculus* cites (15) *Æmilius Sura*, who wrote of the Years of the Sovereignty of the *Roman* People; and he related that between the time that the *Romans* conquered the *Macedonian* King *Philip*, and *Antiochus the Great* in *Asia*, and the Beginning of the Reign of *Ninus* King of *Assyria*, there were 1995 Years. The Conquest of *Antiochus* was in the Year before *Christ* 190, and *Philip* was conquered a few Years before: therefore by the reckoning of this old Writer, *Ninus* began to

168. where he entirely misrepresents *Cephalion*, who reckoned the Reigns of the *Assyrian* Kings from *Ctesias*.

(13) Ὁ Διόδωρος λέγειν αὐταῖς ὅτι χίλις Σαρδανάπαλος δὲ τριακσὺς ἢ πεντήκοντα ἔτι Νίνε (συνησαμένους τὴν ἡγεμονίαν, ἔχοντες ἢ ἡμιμόλιον βασιλεύς Ἀσσυρίων. *Chron.* p. 165. but the present Copies of *Diodorus* omit the Word πεντήκοντα, which is the genuine Reading of *Ctesias* and *Diodorus*. Again he saies, ταῦτα ὁ Διόδωρος οὕτως τὴν Σαρδανάπαλον καὶ τριακσὺς ἢ ἔτι ΛΕ' (i. e. 35.) ἔτι Νίνε γέγονε βασιλεύς Ἀσσυρίων. *Ibid.* Again, ὁ μὲν δὲ [Διόδωρος] ΛΕ' (i. e. 35.) βασιλεὺς ἔτι Νίνε ἢ αὐτὸς ἐξέθετο καὶ τὴν ἄλυσιν Τροίας μετὰ αἱ ἔτη πλείω φησιν, ὡς τινες, ὅτι Κς' (26.) βασιλεύς Ἀσσυρίων Ταυίαν. p. 168. Again, Διόδωρον — πλείω ἢ α' (1300.) ἐρηκτά τ' ὅλον τ' Ἀσσυρίων ἀρχὴς ἔχον. *Ibid.*

(14) Imperium Assyrii mille trecentis annis tenuere, lib. i. c. 2. *Agathias Scholasticus* makes the Term 1306 Years and a little more, lib. ii. p. 63. at the End of the Annals of *Glycas*, and this Number plainly proceeded from the corrupt Number 1360 of *Diodorus*, to whom he refers.

Constantinus Manasses, in his Annals, makes the Duration of the *Assyrian* Empire to be 1303 Years to *Sardanapalus*. So I understand the Words, viz. ὅτι βασιλεὺς πάλιν ἢ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν χίλιοι τρεῖς ἐμέτευσαν ἢ (ὡς αὐτὴ παρῆλθον) τρεῖς ἐκατὸν ἐνιαυτοὶ μέχρι Σαρδανάπαλου. p. 23. Here χίλιοι τρεῖς does not mean 3000; but 1003 Years. But the Copy of *Leo Allatius* read χιλιήτης for χίλιοι τρεῖς, and this is the true Reading, and makes the Term 1300.

(15) *Hist. Rom.* lib. i. p. 17, 28. Commentators have rightly observed that the Passage from *Æmilius Sura* is misplaced in *Velleius Paterculus*; but that is nothing to the Chronology of the Author.

reign

reign in the Year before *Christ* 2185, which agrees exactly to the Time of *Belus* the Father of *Ninus*, according to the Computation of *Ctesias*; but not to *Ninus*, who was placed near 60 Years lower by *Ctesias*. But it very remarkably agrees to the true Time of *Belus* the King of *Babylon*, who reigned 55 Years before *Ninus*, who was thought to succeed him at *Babylon*: for by this Computation *Belus* began to reign in the Year before *Christ* 2240, which differs only 7 Years from the true Beginning of his Reign in the Year before *Christ* 2233, as will be hereafter fully proved.

Having corrected the Errors in the Numbers of *Diodorus Siculus* relating to the *Assyrian* Kings, and the Time of the Continuance of that Empire which he took from *Ctesias*, who transcribed his Account from the Royal Archives of *Persia*, we shall be able very nearly to fix the Chronology of the *Assyrian* Æra from *Ninus*, as it was wrote by (16) *Ctesias*; and which all Chronologers have mistaken.

Assyrian Kings, from Ctesias.

		Years of Reign.		Year before Christ.
1. <i>Ninus</i>	—	52	—	2127
2. <i>Semiramis</i>	—	42	—	2075
3. <i>Ninyas</i>	—	38	—	2033
4. <i>Arius</i>	—	30	—	1995
5. <i>Aralius</i>	—	40	—	1965
6. <i>Xerxes</i> (17) <i>Balæus</i>	—	30	—	1925
7. <i>Armo-nithres</i>	—	38	—	1895
8. <i>Belochus</i> (18)	—	35	—	1857

(16) *Ctesias* transcribed his *Persic* and *Assyrian* History from the Royal Archives, and finished it in the 3^d Year of the 95th Olympiad, and in the Year before *Christ* 398, as *Diodorus Siculus* tells us, lib. xiv. p. 679.

(17) *Eusebius* saies that 150 Years passed from *Semiramis* to *Xerxes*, which fixes the Times of these Reigns, Præp. Evang. lib. x. c. 9. p. 486. *Mose Chorenensis* calls him *Balæus Cheoxarus*. Hist. Armen. lib. i. p. 51.

(18) *Eusebius* cites *Clemens Alexandrinus*, saying that the Exodus of the Jews, under *Moses*, out of *Egypt* happened in the 32^d Year of the Reign of *Beloch* the 8th King of *Assyria*, from *Ninus*, and in the 402^d Year of the

9. *Balæus*

	Years of Reign.	Years before Christ.
9. <i>Balæus</i>	52	1822
10. <i>Sethos</i> (19) [called <i>Altadas</i>]	35	1770
11. <i>Mamytbus</i>	30	1735
12. <i>Ascalius</i> [or <i>Maschaleus</i>]	30	1705
13. <i>Sphærus</i>	28	1675
14. <i>Mamylus</i>	30	1647
15. <i>Spartbæus</i>	42	1617
16. <i>Ascatades</i>	40	1575

Affyrian Empire according to *Ctesias*, τῷ δαλίρῳ ἐ τελεχισιοσῶ ἐτὶ τῷ Ἀσσυρίῳ ἀρχῆς. So the present Copies of *Eusebius* have it. But *Clemens* wrote not in the 402^d, but the 302^d Year; τῷ δαλίρῳ καὶ τελεχισιοσῶ. The Error and Deficiency of the present Copies of *Clemens* arose from the Copier omitting all the Words between one δαλίρῳ in the Beginning and another in the End of the Passage: and the entire Sentence of *Clemens* was, τῷ δαλίρῳ καὶ τελεχισιοσῶ ἐτὶ τῷ Ἀσσυρίῳ ἀρχῆς, τῷ δὲ Βηλέχῳ τοῦ ὀγδοῦ δυναστείας τῷ δαλίρῳ καὶ τελεχισῶ, ἡ Μωσέως — ἐξ Αἰγύπτου κίνησις. apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. x. c. 12. p. 497. Clem. Strom. i. p. 379. The present Reading of *Clemens* is, τῷ δαλίρῳ καὶ τελεχισῶ ἡ Μωσέως, etc. which shews plainly how the Defect happened. The learned Archbishop *Potter* has observed how the Defect of the Words of *Clemens* may be supplied from *Eusebius*: but as he does not meddle with chronological Matters, he is not sensible of the Error in the Copy of *Eusebius*, which has τελεχισιοσῶ for τελεχισιοσῶ, as observed above. And that 302 is the true Number is most certain, because by the Numbers both of *Africanus* and *Eusebius*, as above set down, it is exactly 301 Years from the first of *Ninus*, reckoned by *Ctesias* the first *Affyrian* King, to the 32^d Year of the 8th King *Belochus*. And that the Years of these Reigns are right will be farther proved from *Cephalion* in another Note. But we may here observe, that the Time of the Exodus of the *Jews* is carried many years too high to bring it to the Reign of *Inachus*, *Amosis*, and *Beloch*: whereby it is placed in the Year 1826, before the Christian Æra.

(19) I have restored this Number (which in *Eusebius* is 32) of *Sethos* from the chronological Extracts of a barbarous old *Latin* Writer, published and recommended by *Scaliger* in his Edition of the Chronicon of *Eusebius*, p. 74. who took his Extracts from *Africanus*, *Eusebius*, and *Castor*. Note also, that the 12th King has but 22 Years in *Syncellus*, who has shortened the Numbers of *Africanus* and *Eusebius* in this Reign. In the 13th Reign *Eusebius* has set down 20 Years instead of 28, as *Africanus* had them. *Eusebius* has also dropped 2 Years in the 15th Reign. And both *Syncellus* and *Eusebius* make the 17th Reign 45 Years instead of 50, which last Number is restored in the old *Latin* Author above-mentioned.

17. *Amyntes*

	Years of Reign.	Years before Christ.
17. <i>Amyntes</i>	50	1535
18. <i>Belochus</i> [2 ^d] (20)	25	1485

Eusebius in his *Chronicon* relates, that *Atossa* the Daughter of *Beloch* the second, who was also called *Semiramis*, reigned with her Father 12 Years; but most of *Pontacus's* MSS. say, 7 Years. *Conon* in his ninth Narration ascribes to this *Semiramis* or *Atossa*, all the Exploits of the first *Semiramis*. The old *Latin Chronicle* in *Scaliger* places this *Semiramis* before *Beloch*; and assigns 23 Years to her Reign. This Account he probably took from *Castor*, as he did the 19 Years Reign of the second *Ninus* after *Sardanapalus*. *Agathias* calls this King *Belleus*; and relates from *Bion* and *Alexander Polyhistor*, that he was the Son of *Dercetadas*, and the last of the Line of *Semiramis*, and was succeeded by *Beletaras*, the Keeper of the royal Gardens, who in a surprizing Manner advanced himself to the Empire; and his Family kept it to the Reign of *Sardanapalus*. lib. ii. p. 63.

19. <i>Baletores</i> or <i>Beletaras</i> (21)	34	1460
20. <i>Lamprides</i> (22)	37	1426
21. <i>Sofares</i>	20	1389
22. <i>Lampares</i>	30	1369
23. <i>Panyas</i>	45	1339

(20) *Cephalion* calls this King *Belimus*, and saies that *Ctesias* reckoned about 640 Years from *Ninus* to his Reign, apud *Syncel.* p. 167. and they are 642 by my Computation. So that we cannot err more than a Year or two in the first 17 Reigns. And this Observation of *Cephalion* confirms what is said in the 18th Note above, about the Number 302, instead of Number 402.

(21) *Eusebius* and *Syncellus* give this King no more than 30 Years. But the old *Latin Chronicle* from *Africanus* gives him 34 Years; which is probably the true Number.

(22) To this Reign *Syncellus* has no more than 30 Years. *Eusebius*, the old *Latin Chronicle*, and *Cassiodorus*, have 32. But *Jornandes*, in his Copy of *Eusebius*, had 37 Years, which I think is the true Number. Lib. de regn. et tempor. Success.

	Years of Reign.		Years before Christ.	
24. <i>Sofarmus</i> (23)	—	42 ———	—	1294
25. <i>Mitræus</i> (24)	—	37 ———	—	1252
26. <i>Teutamus</i> or <i>Tautanus</i> (25)	32 ———	—	—	1215

(23) *Sofarmus* has no more than 22 Years in *Syncellus*; and but 19 in *Eusebius* and *Cassiodorus*, and 20 in the old *Latin Chronicle*. But *Scaliger* in his *Animadversions* on the *Chronicon* of *Eusebius*, (p. 47.) saies that the *Greek* of *Africanus* had 42 Years, which he accordingly assigns to his Reign in the second Book of his *Isagogic Canons*, p. 138. where he found this Number he does not say. But it is highly probable to be the true Number; because without it the Sum total of *Ctesias* will fall short 20 Years: these 20 additional Years are also necessary to bring the taking of *Troy* within the Reign of *Teutamus*, in which we are assured *Ctesias* placed it from the *Persian* and *Assyrian Annals*. They are farther necessary to supply the Defect of 60 Years or more, in the *Chronicon* of *Eusebius*, who reckoned no more than 1240 Years from *Ninus* to the End of *Sardanapalus* and of the *Assyrian Empire*, though he knew and owned that *Ctesias* computed this Period to be more than 1300 Years (Apud *Syncel.* p. 168) This Defalcation of 60 Years or more, in the *Chronicon* of *Eusebius*, is the Key to find out the true Numbers by following the larger Numbers of *Africanus*, from other Writers where they can be come at, who delivered the Numbers of *Ctesias* as he found them.

(24) Here again the old *Latin Chronicle* from *Africanus* helps us; which has 35 Years; which I think should be 37: for the old *Vatican MS.* in *Pontacus's* Edition of the *Chronicon* of *Eusebius*, edit. *Burdigalæ*, 1604, has this Number. *Syncellus* and other Copies of *Eusebius* have no more than 27, and *Pontacus* from other MSS. follows this Number, which is undoubtedly too short, though it might be the Number of *Eusebius*. But whether the Number 37 or 35 be most probably the true Number of *Africanus* from *Ctesias*, the learned Reader may judge, when he has considered the following Note.

(25) *Ctesias*, or others, (for the Account was not in the *Assyrian Records*) related that *Teutamus* sent *Memnon*, who was Son of *Titbonus*, the *Præfect* of *Persia*, with an Army to assist *Priam*, at the Siege of *Troy*, against the *Greeks*. *Diod. Sic. lib. ii. p. 136. Wesseling.* But as it is uncertain in what Year *Ctesias*, or the Authors of the Story, placed the taking of *Troy*, we cannot be certain in what Year of the Reign of *Teutamus* they placed it. If they thought *Troy* was taken in the Year before Christ 1209, where the *Parian Marbles* place the taking of it, and if *Teutamus* sent the Army in the last Year of the War, it was in the 7th Year of his Reign: but if they placed it in the Year before Christ 1183, which is the truest *Æra* of it, then it was in the last Year

27. *Teutæus*

		Years of Reign.		Years before Christ.
27. Teutæus (26)	—	44	—	1183
28. Thineus	—	30	—	1139

of his Reign; and here the old *Latin Chronicle* from *Africanus*, or from *Castor*, placed the taking of *Troy*, viz. in the 32^d Year of *Teutamus*. Anno isto [sc. Teutami] tricesimo secundo confixus est Sol ab Achæis. This *Scaliger*, like a Critic, observes was his Author's barbarous Mis-translation of the *Greek Words*: τέτρετα λβ'. ἤλω Ἰλίον ὑπὸ Ἀχαιῶν, i. e. in his 32^d Year *Troy* was taken by the Greeks. *Eusebius* having placed *Ninus* in the Year before *Christ* 2058, sixty nine Years lower than *Ctesias* had fixed him, could not bring *Teutamus* to the Time of the *Trojan War* without shortening the Reigns of the *Assyrian Kings*; and so this was a wilful Corruption of the Text of *Ctesias*, and an arbitrary Computation of the Reigns of the *Assyrian Kings*, merely to serve a groundless Hypothesis: for he is entirely mistaken in the Time of *Ninus*, as will be shewn. He has, in the Interval between *Ninus* and *Teutamus*, shortned the Term of *Ctesias* about 55 Years, to serve his mistaken Notion of the Taking of *Troy* falling in the Reign of *Teutamus*, which I shall prove was 79 Years before he began to reign, though *Ctesias* or others from his Account, place it in the Reign of *Teutamus*, and *Diodorus* does not say that *Ctesias* himself did so. It must here be also observed in Proof of my Computation of the Numbers of *Ctesias*, that it agrees exactly to his reckoning a 1000 Years, or something more, from the Beginning of the *Assyrian Empire* in *Belus*, as *Cephalion* understood it, to the taking of *Troy*. Now if we reckon *Belus* to have reigned 55 Years, which is the Number given to the *Babylonian Belus* in *Syncellus*, from *Africanus*, who supposed him to reign immediately before *Ninus*, his Reign and the *Assyrian Empire* will commence in the Year before *Christ*, 2182, and thence to the Year before *Christ* 1183 is 999 Years. And if *Belus* reigned 62 Years, as the old *Latin Chronicle* saies he did, then the Interval between *Belus* and the Destruction of *Troy*, will be more, i. e. six Years more than a thousand Years. And our Computation makes it also probable that *Ctesias* fixed the *Æra* of *Troy* to the Year before *Christ* 1183, for if we suppose him to have placed it in the Year before *Christ* 1209, with the *Parian Marbles*, a thousand Years reckoned back from thence, would reach to the Year before *Christ* 2209, which is 27 Years higher than the Reign of *Belus*.

The *Memnon* who is related to have been sent by *Teutamus*, with an Army to assist the *Trojans* against the *Greeks*, is said to have built the Palace in the Castle of *Susa* (where his Father *Titbonus* dwelt) called after his Name *Memnonia*: and also to have made a public Road called the *Via Memnonia*. But the *Egyptians* of *Upper Egypt* question this Relation concerning *Memnon*, and say he was an *Æthiopian*; and built the Palace there called *Memnonia*. *Diod. Sic. lib. ii. p. 136.* *Pausanias* reconciles the two Accounts, telling us, that *Memnon* was of an *Æthiopian* Family, but that he went to *Troy* not from

	Years of Reign.		Years before Christ.	
29. <i>Dercylus</i>	—	40	—	1109
30. <i>Empacmes</i>	—	38	—	1069
31. <i>Laosthenes</i> (27)	—	45	—	1031
32. <i>Pertiades</i>	—	30	—	986
33. <i>Opbrataeus</i> (28)	—	21	—	956
34. <i>Epbecheres</i> (29)	—	52	—	935
35. <i>Acraganes</i> (30)	—	42	—	883

Æthiopia, but from *Susa* in *Persia*. Phoc. p. 348. edit. 1583. The Truth seems to be, that *Titbonus* went from *Æthiopia* into *Persia*; where he built *Susa*, the Capital City of that Kingdom, about the Year before Christ 1230. He was a white *Æthiopian* of the Country about *Syene*, where the Inhabitants were white: and this is more probable than that he was the Brother of *Priam* King of *Troy*, as Diod. Sic. relates, lib. iv. p. 319. and Homer. Il. xx. v. 237. See Herodot. lib. v. c. 53. Strab. lib. xv. p. 1058. Philostrat. de vit. Apollon. Tyan. c. 4. lib. vi. The Story of *Memnon* going with an Army to *Troy*, to assist *Priam*, may well be suspected, because *Homer* does not mention it, though he is very particular in recounting the Forces and Auxiliaries on both Sides; and *Strabo* observes that he never makes Mention of the *Assyrians* or *Babylonians* at all, Geog. lib. xv. p. 1068. *Memnon* was a famous *Æthiopian* Architect of *Upper Egypt*; and several Palaces in the *Upper Egypt* at *Abydos* and *Thebes*, were called from him *Memnonia*. Strab. Geog. lib. xvii. p. 1167, Perhaps he might be an Ancestor of *Titbonus*, who called his Son *Memnon* from his Progenitor: and if so, the *Æthiopian* Account and that of the *Susians* are reconcileable to each other.

(26) *Eusebius* gives *Teutæus* no more than 40 Years, but *Africanus* in *Syncellus* gave him 44 Years.

(27) *Laosthenes* is mentioned by *Cyril* in his Book against *Julian* p. 11. as reigning in the 165th Year after the taking of *Troy*, that is, in the Year before Christ 1019, and this was the 13th Year of his Reign. This Testimony is an Argument of the Truth of my Computation.

(28) *Eusebius* gives this King no more than 20 Years: but *Africanus* in *Syncellus* gave him 21 Years.

(29) This King has but 50 Years in *Eusebius*: so I have taken the Number 52 from *Africanus* in *Syncellus*. I have noted all the Differences between *Eusebius* and the true Numbers of *Ctesias* taken from *Africanus* and other Writers; and it appears that *Eusebius* shortned the Numbers of *Ctesias* about 62 Years.

(30) *Acraganes* agrees in the Years of his Reign with *Asar-Haddon*, but must have been another Person.

	Years of Reign.	Years before Christ.
36. <i>Thonos Concolerus</i> (31) } or <i>Sardanapalus</i>	— 20 ——— ———	841

Total from *Ninus* to the End of the Reign of *Sardanapalus*, in the Year before *Christ* 821, 1305 Years.

Median Kings who succeeded in the Assyrian Empire after *Thonus Concolerus* called *Sardanapalus*, according to *Ctesias*.

	Years of Reign.	Years before Christ.
1. <i>Arbaces</i> ———	28 ———	821
2. His Son (32) <i>Mandaucēs</i> } or <i>Madaucēs</i>	— 20 ———	793
3. <i>Sofarmus</i> ———	30 ———	773
4. <i>Artycas</i> (33) ———	30 ———	743

(31) *Athenæus* relates from *Cleitarchus* that *Sardanapalus* died of old Age after he had lost the Syrian [i. e. *Assyrian*] Empire, *Deipnos.* lib. xii. p. 530. This was true of *Asordan* or *Asaradin*, who reigned 42 Years after the Revolt of the *Medes*: but it is not true that he lost his whole Empire. This must be a different *Sardanapalus* from him who, when *Nineveh* was taken by the *Medes* and *Babylonians*, burnt himself in his Palace. But *Ctesias* and the *Greeks* confounded their Names, Times, and the Transactions of their Reigns. This is the *Sardanapalus*, who is said to have built *Tarsus* and *Anchiale* in *Cilicia* both in one Day; and to have erected a Monument with the Figure of a Man cracking with the Fingers of his right Hand; and an Inscription exhorting the Reader to indulge his Genius with Feasting, Wine, and Women, for that all other Things were not worth a Crack with the Fingers. See *Strab. Geog.* lib. xiv. p. 988: *Athenæi Deipnos.* lib. xii. p. 530. *Cellar. Geog. Antiq.* lib. iii. c. 6. sect. 57. *Suid.* voce *Σαρδαναπ.* *Steph. de urb. voc.* *Αρχιἀλη,* *Arrian. Expedit. Alex.* lib. ii. p. 91. *Schol. ad Aristoph. Aves,* p. 590. *Plut. de Virtut. Alex. Orat.* ii. p. 336. And as this *Sardanapalus* seems to be *Asar-Haddon*, he succeeded *Thonus Concolerus*; and *Ctesias* has made a Mistake: and *Thonus Concolerus* was probably the *Anacyndaraxes* who was the Father of *Sardanapalus*. *Athen. Deipnos.* lib. xii. p. 528, 529, 530.

(32) In *Diod. Sic.* lib. ii. p. 146, etc. this King has 50 Years: and in *Eusebius* 40, but *Africanus* in *Syncel.* p. 197. gives him no more than 20 Years which is, I think, the true Number, and agrees best with the Term of the Median Empire.

(33) The present Editions of *Diod. Sic.* make this King reign 50 Years,
5. *Arbianes*

	Years of Reign.		Years before Christ.	
5. <i>Arbianes</i> (34)	—	22	—	713
6. <i>Artæus</i> (35)	—	40	—	691
7. <i>Artynes</i> (36)	—	22	—	651
8. <i>Astibaras</i> (37)	—	40	—	629
9. <i>Astyias</i> (38)	—	35	—	589

The Sum total of the Duration of the *Median* Empire to the End of the Reign of *Astyias* is 267 Years to the Year before Christ 554, and this wants only four Years of the true Account of the *Æra* from *Arbaces* to *Cyrus's* Conquest of *Astyages*.

but most of the MSS. have 30 Years; and also *Africanus* in *Syncellus*, *ibid.* and this, no Doubt, is the true Number. He is omitted by *Eusebius* the better to suit his Chronology: but *Africanus* had him.

(34) This Name is omitted both by *Eusebius* and *Africanus* in *Syncellus*, (unless it be the Omission of *Syncellus* only) and they give the following King *Artæus* 54 Years. *Moses Chorenensis* Hist. Armen. p. 58. omits also *Arbianes*, and puts *Cardiceas* in his Place, from *Eusebius*, as it seems, who placeth this Name after the third King, from what Authority I know not; for he is not owned by *Africanus*.

(35) This is the King called *Deioces* by *Herodotus*, who gives him 53 Years, and makes him the first *Median* King after the Revolt from the King of *Assyria*.

(36) *Artynes* is the same King with *Pbraortes*, the Son of *Dejoces*; and *Herodotus* gives him 22 Years, as *Ctesias* did to *Artynes*, lib. i. c. 102.

(37) *Astibaras* is the King called *Cyaxares* by *Herodotus* and most of the Greek Writers, lib. i. c. 103. and *Herodotus* gives to his Reign 40 Years, as *Ctesias* did to *Astibaras*. He is called *Astibaras* by *Alexander Polyhistor* in *Eusebius*, Præp. Evang. lib. ix. c. 39. and also by *Nicolaus Damascenus* in Excerpt. Vales. p. 438.

(38) The Greeks call him *Astyages*, so *Herodotus*, etc. his other Name was *Aspadas*, as *Ctesias* called him in *Diod. Sic.* *Ctesias* also called him *Astyias*, as *Pbotius* tells us. The Reason of the different Names of these Kings is, that one is the Name they had before they came to the Throne, and the other that which they assumed when they entered upon their Government. On the same Account the *Assyrian*, *Babylonian*, *Persian*, and *Egyptian* Kings had two Names; and they are called either by one or the other in Historians, which is necessary to be observed. I have taken the Years of the Reign of *Astyages* from *Herodotus*, because they are not mentioned by *Diodorus Siculus* from *Ctesias*.

These

These were most probably the Numbers of the Years of the *Assyrian* Kings in the Catalogue of *Ctesias* from *Ninus* to the End of the Reign of *Tbonus Concolerus*, called also *Sardanapalus*; and also the Numbers of the Years from *Arbaces*, whom *Ctesias* supposed to have founded the *Median* Empire, to the End of the Reign of *Astyages*, when it was destroyed by *Cyrus*.

The Number of Years from *Ninus* to *Sardanapalus*, could not be either much more, or much less than I have made it; because *Ctesias* wrote as *Diodorus Siculus* related in several Places from him, that the *Assyrians* ruled in *Asia* something more than 1300 Years, and therefore in reckoning them to be 1305, we cannot err above three or four Years.

Now as *Ctesias*, who lived 17 Years in the Court of *Artaxerxes* the second, in Quality of a Physician, and in great Repute, extracted his History, as he said, and *Diodorus* relates from him, (39) out of the *Royal Records*; we may well conclude that the Years of every Reign were truly set down in them; and that the Sum was, as *Ctesias* wrote, more than 1300 Years from *Ninus* to *Sardanapalus*. These Years *Ctesias* thought did reach to the Dissolution of the *Assyrian* Empire; and as this Empire was destroyed by the *Medes* and *Babylonians*, and in the Reign of a King commonly called by the *Greeks* *Sardanapalus*, *Ctesias* by a great Mistake took his 36th King *Tbonus Concolerus* to be the *Sardanapalus* in whose Reign *Nineveh* was taken, and the *Assyrian* Empire destroyed, and subjected to the *Medes* and *Babylonians*. He therefore goes on from this *Sardanapalus* to the *Medes*, and gives the true Years of the several Præfects down to the first King *Dejoces*, and to the End of the *Median* Empire, as if they had been all Kings who reigned successively after *Sardanapalus* in the *Assyrian* Empire. But it is certain that *Arbaces* the *Mede*, and his Successors to *Dejoces*, whom *Ctesias* mentioned as reigning over the greatest Part of the *Assyrian* Empire after *Sardanapalus*, were only Præfects under the Kings of *Assyria*, who preceded *Tbonus Concolerus* called falsely *Sardanapalus*; and the *Assyrian* Empire still subsisted, and had both *Media* and *Babylon*

(39) Ἐκ τῶν βασιλικῶν διφθερῶν. lib. ii. p. 146.

under it, till the Revolt of the *Medes* under the last Præfect *Arbianes*, some Years before they chose *Dejoces* for their King.

This Account is entirely agreeable to *Herodotus*, who knew of no *Median* King before *Dejoces*; but he knew there were Kings of *Affyria* both when he reigned in *Media*, and many Years after: and of the Truth of this we are assured from Scripture, which relates the historical Actions of these *Affyrian* Kings; and some of whose Names are recorded. *Senacherib* one of the *Affyrian* Kings reigned at *Nineveh* several Years before *Dejoces* was made King of *Media*, and above an hundred Years after the Time that *Ctesias* supposed *Nineveh* and the *Affyrian* Empire to have been destroyed by *Arbaces*: this *Affyrian* King is mentioned by (40) *Herodotus*, and by (41) *Berosus* as *Josephus* tells us. *Herodotus* also (42) relates that *Pbraortes* the second King of the *Medes* was slain in a Battle with the *Affyrians* who reigned at *Nineveh*. He does not mention the Name of the King, but he is called *Nabuchodonosor* in the History of *Judith*, c. i. § 1. And *Herodotus* farther (43) relates that *Cyaxares*, the last King of the *Medes* but one, was the King who conquered *Nineveh*, and destroyed the *Affyrian* Empire.

So that *Ctesias* by an unaccountable Mistake supposed the *Medes*, etc. not only to have revolted from the King of *Affyria*, but also to have destroyed the *Affyrian* Empire with *Nineveh* the Seat of it, so as that no Kings of *Affyria* ever reigned after; and all this above an hundred Years before the *Medes* or any other Nations revolted from it; as we are assured both from the Scripture-History of the *Affyrian* Kings, and also from *Herodotus* the most faithful *Greek* Historian; and above 200 Years before the *Affyrian* Empire was really destroyed by the *Medes* and *Babylonians*. *Arbaces*, by the Account of *Ctesias*, reigned 110 Years before the Death of *Senacherib*; soon after which the Revolt of the *Medes* commenced in the Year before *Christ* 711, and *Nineveh* was taken, and the *Affyrian* Empire destroyed, in the Year before

(40) Lib. ii. c. 141. and seems to be the *Tbonus Concolerus* of *Ctesias*.

(41) Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 1. p. 513.

(42) Lib. i. c. 102.

(43) Ibid. c. 106.

Christ 606, as will hereafter be shewn: and it is observable, that the Times of the four first *Median* Kings of *Ctesias* reach to the Reign of *Senacherib*, from whence we may be sure that they were Præfects only of *Media* under the Kings of *Assyria* who reigned before *Sardanapalus*, and the Revolt of the *Medes* under the fifth Præfect *Arbianes*; and a few Years, i. e. 22 or 23 Years, before *Dejoces* was made King of the *Medes*; and whom *Ctesias* has placed most probably in his true Time, if he reigned no more than 40 Years.

Therefore, if the *Median* Kings of *Ctesias* before *Dejoces* be considered as they ought to be, as being Præfects of *Media* only under the *Assyrian* Kings, till the Time of the Revolt under that Præfect who immediately preceded *Dejoces*, and so we bring the *Ctesian Sardanapalus* an hundred and eleven Years lower than *Ctesias* has done, his Reign will end in the Year before *Christ* 711, the very Year in which *Senacherib* was slain, and a little before the Revolt of the *Medes*, in the Beginning of the Reign of *Asordan* or *Asar-Haddon*, who was the first *Greek Sardanapalus*, and succeeded *Tbonus Concolerus*: and by this Computation in Consequence *Ninus* will begin to reign in the Year before *Christ* 2016, where we shall find it truly commenced: and *Ctesias* has placed him too high by an hundred and eleven Years. The Error of *Ctesias* seems to have been this: viz. He found in the *Persian* Annals of the *Assyrian* Kings a Revolt of the *Medes* and *Babylonians* mentioned in the Reign of *Asar-Adon*, called in the Version of the *Greek* Septuagint *Asordan*, 2 Kings xix. 37: and *Assaradin* in the *Ptolemaic* Canon. *Ctesias* took him to be *Tbonus Concolerus*, and that *Sardanapalus* in whose Reign the *Medes* and *Babylonians* took *Nineveh*, and destroyed the *Assyrian* Empire, which was thenceforth transferred to the *Medes*, and so placed this Destruction of the *Assyrian* Empire in the End of his Reign: He found by the Years of the Reigns of the *Assyrian* Kings that they had then from *Ninus* reigned in *Asia* more than 1300 Years; and taking *Arbaces* the *Mede* to have been the first King of *Media*, he of Course must reckon the 1300 Years and more of the *Assyrian* Empire to precede the Reign of *Arbaces*, and to be the whole Continuance of that Empire. From *Arbaces* he found it was 267 Years to the End of the *Median* Empire with the Reign of the last

King *Asyages*, which was by his Reckoning, in the Year before *Christ* 554, but more truly 550, so he reckoned more than 1567 Years to that Year before the Christian *Æra*; and carried *Ninus* more than 2121 Years, or, as I have reckoned it, 2126 Years before the Christian *Æra*. By this Management he both placed *Ninus* 111 or 112 Years too high; and made the Term of the *Assyrian* Empire less than it really was, by above an hundred Years; for it continued after the Revolt of the *Medes* to the Year before *Christ* 606. This Revolt happened not at the End, as *Ctesias* thought, of the Reign of *Sardanapalus* or *Asar-Haddon*, but in the Beginning of it. For *Cleitarchus* (44) who lived in the Time of *Alexander the Great*, and accompanied him in his Expeditions, related that *Sardanapalus* died of old Age, after he had lost his Empire, and *Castor* (45) saies that he was succeeded in the *Assyrian* Empire, by *Ninus* the second. So that though *Ctesias* quite mistook in his Computation both of the Beginning and Ending of the *Assyrian* Empire: yet the *Assyrians* had reigned in *Asia* more than 1300 Years, when the *Medes* revolted and gained their Liberty: and 1305 Years from *Ninus* to the Revolt in the Year before *Christ* 711, placeth the Beginning of his Reign and of the *Assyrian* Empire, in the Year before *Christ* 2016, which is the true Place of it, as will be proved.

Having fully considered the Chronology of the *Assyrian* Kings from *Ninus*, as *Ctesias* wrote it from the *Persian* Annals, and shewn the several Errors contained in it, though in other Respects it is of inestimable Value; I shall proceed to fix by indisputable Evidence, the true Time of *Ninus* and Beginning of the *Assyrian* Empire; and the Interval between him and the *Babylonian Belus*, from the most ancient and authentic *Chaldean* Records.

Castor, *Cephalion*, and the ancients in general, who had not read the History of *Berosus* and *Abydenus*, thought *Ninus* to be the Son of *Belus* who had reigned before him over the *Assyrians*, and that this was also the *Belus* who reigned at *Babylon*.

Castor in his Canon of the *Assyrian* Kings (46) saies; “ that *Belus*

(44) Apud Athenæi Deipnos. lib. xii. p. 530.

(45) Syncel. Chronograph. p. 206.

(46) “Ετεροι φασι νῦν Σαρδανάπαλον κρατῆσαι τὴν Ασσυρίαν ἀρχῆς Νίνου, ὥς πρὸς ἐ
“ was

“ was the first *Assyrian* King ; but as there was no Certainty of the
 “ Time of his Reign-transmitted, he set down his Name ; but deduced
 “ the Epoch of his Chronography from *Ninus* ; and ended the *Assy-*
 “ *rian* Æra with *Ninus* who succeeded *Sardanapalus*.”

Cephalion an eminent Writer of Chronology in the Time of the Em-
 peror *Adrian* (47) saies ; “ I shall write an Account of those Things
 “ which have been related by others, and principally by *Hellanicus* of
 “ *Lesbos*, *Ctesias* of *Cnidus*, and *Herodotus* of *Halicarnassus*. In an-
 “ cient Times the *Assyrians* ruled in *Asia*, and *Ninus* the Son of *Belus*
 “ was King.”

Almost all Historians (48) agree that *Ninus* was the first King of
Assyria ; and generally agree also that he was the Son of *Belus* ; but
 certainly not of the *Babylonian Belus* who was as famous in History as
Ninus was, and his Time as well known : nor do *Castor* and *Cephalion*
 suppose *Ninus* to be the Son of *Belus* who reigned at *Babylon*, but of
Belus who reigned before him over the *Assyrians*. And as they knew
 nothing certainly of this *Belus*, they began their Chronology of the
Assyrian Empire from *Ninus*, whose History was well known. . But
Africanus made *Ninus* Son of the *Assyrian Belus* to succeed the *Baby-*
lonian Belus, as if he was the same, though he reigned, as we shall see
 presently, several Generations before *Ninus* ; and *Africanus* had before
 him Evidence from *Abydenus* that he did so : and by this gross Mistake
 has misled all Chronologers to this Day. *Ctesias* knew nothing either
 of the *Assyrian Belus* as being the Father of *Ninus*, or of *Ninus* suc-

Κάτωρ ἐν τῷ Κανόνι αὐτῷ φησὶν, ὡδε. πρῶτους μὲν εἶναι τὰς Ἀσσυρίων βασιλεῖς κατατε-
 τάχαμεν, ἢ μὲν ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ Βήλῃς πεποιημένους. τῷδε, τῷ τῷ βασιλείας αὐτῷ ἔτι [leg.
 τὸ τῷ βασιλείας αὐτῷ ἔτι] μὴ πρᾶδεδοῖσθαι σαφῶς· ἢ μὲν ὀνόματι μνημονόομεν,
 ἢ δὲ ἀρχὴν τῷ χρονολογίας ἀπὸ Νίνῃς πεποιήκαμεν, ἢ καταλήγομεν ὅτι Νίνον τῷ δια-
 δεξάμενον τὴν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ Σαρδαναπάλλῃς. Syncel. Chronograph. p. 205, 206.

(47) Παρέσω Κεφαλίων ἐπίσημοι εἶς, ἔχῃ ὁ τυχὼν, ἔτω φάσκων. ἀρχομαι γράφειν
 αἰφ' ὧν ἄλλοι ἐμνημόνευσαν· ἢ τὰ πρῶτα Ἑλλανικός τε ὁ Λέσβιος ἢ Κτησίας ὁ Κνι-
 δις, ἢ περὶ Ἡρόδοτος, ὁ Ἀλικαρνασσέως. τὸ παλαιὸν τῷ Ἀσίας ἐκασίλδυσαν οἱ Ἀσσύ-
 ριοι, ἢ δὲ ὁ Βήλῃς Νίνος. Syncel. Chronograph. p. 167.

(48) Primus omnium Ninus rex Assyriorum, etc. Just. lib. i. init. from
Trogus Pompeius who followed *Diodorus Siculus*. And *Orosius* saies ; omnes
 propemodum tam apud Græcos quam apud Latinos — initium scribendi a
 NinoBeli filio rege Assyriorum fecere. lib. i. c. 1.

ceeding the *Babylonian Belus*. He related from the Archives of the *Affyrian* Kings “ that (49) *Asia* was at first governed by Kings who
 “ were Natives of the Countries where they ruled : but neither their
 “ Actions were famed, nor their Names (50) recorded. But the first
 “ King (of *Asia*) whose Memory is recorded in History, was *Ninus*
 “ King of the *Affyrians*, who performed great and famous Exploits.
 “ Being of a warlike Disposition, and warmed with Ambition, he
 “ taught the bravest of the Youths the Use and Exercise of Arms,
 “ and inured them to martial Discipline and Dangers : and having
 “ raised a great Army, and made an Alliance with *Ariæus* (51) King
 “ of *Arabia* — he invaded *Babylonia* with a great Force, and conquer-
 “ ed it, and having taken the King Captive with his Children, he slew
 “ him, and made the Kingdom tributary.” Hence it appears that *Ctesias* knew nothing of *Ninus* being the Son of *Belus*, or that *Belus* was King of *Affyria*, and much less that he succeeded the *Babylonian Belus*.

Therefore if *Ninus* was the Son of *Belus*, as many of the Ancients thought, this *Belus* must be an *Affyrian*, and not the *Babylonian Belus*.

(49) Diod. Sic. Biblioth. lib. ii. init.

(50) *Moses Chorenensis* in his *Armenian* History, lib. i. c. 13. relates from *Maribas* of *Catina*, that *Ninus* elated with Pride and Ambition in order to be thought the first great Conqueror, and Beginner of heroical Achievements caused all the ancient Annals of the famous Exploits which were done before his Time to be burnt ; and the History of his own Actions and Reign only to be recorded. *Maribas* did not find this Relation in the *Affyrian* Records which he consulted, but gave it as the Opinion of some private Writers. The Truth is ; the Annals of the *Affyrian* Kings kept at *Nineveh* [which were probably those from which *Ctesias* extracted his History] began with the Reign of *Ninus*, who was the first King of *Affyria*, and founded that Empire by his Conquests : and this *Moses* plainly intimates, lib. i. c. 13. p. 40.

(51) This *Ariæus* was probably *Arioch* King of *Ellasar* or *Arabia* who assisted *Cbederlaomer* King of *Elam* against the five Kings who had rebelled against him, *Gen.* xiv. § 1, 4. The Times exactly agree ; for *Ninus* invaded *Babylonia* about two Years after this War mentioned by *Moses*, and in the Year before *Christ* 2016. And *Amraphel* was the King of *Skinar* or *Babylonia* whom he took and slew. He was called *Arbel*, or, as *Africanus* has it, *Arabel* in the *Chaldean* Annals. And as *Ninus* conquered *Persia* or *Elam* at the same Time with *Babylonia*, 'tis probable that *Cbederlaomer* was then the King of *Elam* who became tributary to him.

He seems to have been a patriarchal Governor, and not properly a King, or an absolute Monarch ; for all ancient Writers in a Manner agree, that *Ninus* was the (52) first who set up an absolute Monarchy amongst the *Affyrians* : and therefore it is probable that he caused his Father to be worshiped ; and so he became the *Affyrian* God, *Bel* or *Belus*. Here we may date the Idolatry of Hero-Worship amongst the *Affyrians*, from about the Year before *Christ* 2016, or a few Years after. *Constantine* (53) *Manasses* in his Annals has placed *Belus* the Father of *Ninus*, very rightly in the Time of *Abraham* ; and saies he ruled over the *Affyrians*, and was worshiped as a God, and called *Cronus* or *Saturn*. It was usual amongst the ancients to call those who were thought to be the first Kings, by the Name of *Cronus* or *Saturn* : and so we find a *Babylonian*, *Phœnician*, *Egyptian*, *Arabian*, as well as an *Affyrian Cronus* or *Saturn* : and the *Greeks* and *Latins* who received the Names of their oldest Gods from *Phœnicia* and *Egypt*, had their *Cronus* or *Saturn*. *Glycas* (54) also in the second Part of his Annals calls this *Belus*, *Cronus* ; and saies he was of the Posterity of *Sem*, and was the first King of *Affyria* and the Father of *Ninus* : but the *Babylonian Belus* descended from *Ham*. Besides this latter *Belus* reigned at *Babylon*, and was buried there : but the *Affyrian* Kings all reigned at *Nineveh*, and governed *Babylon* by a Vice-Roy.

(52) *Primus omnium Ninus rex Affyriorum veterem et quasi avitum gentium morem nova imperii cupiditate mutavit. Just. from Trogus Pompeius, lib. i. c. 1.* Hence it appears that the *Affyrians* were a free People before *Ninus* reigned over them. And as they had no King before *Ninus*, it is probable that Hero-Worship was not known amongst them, till *Ninus* instituted the Worship of his Father, who was thenceforth their *Belus*, *Bel* or *Lord*. All Hero-Worship was originally the Worship of dead Men and Women who had been Kings and Queens of the Countries where they were worshiped : and this Worship was at first set up by Kings who had an absolute Power over their People, and instituted what Superstition they pleased. But Kings also ordered Legislators, and other famous Men to be worshiped.

Therefore as the Countries of *Babylon*, *Chaldæa*, *Phœnicia* and *Egypt* were ruled by Kings long before *Ninus* reigned in *Affyria*, so the Idolatry of Hero-Worship was practised amongst them many Years before his Time.

(53) *Annal. p. 23.*

(54) *Annal. Part. ii. p. 129.*

These

•These Observations are evident Proofs that *Belus* the Father of *Ninus* was not the *Babylonian* King called by the same Name.

Moses Chorenensis (55) has preserved for us a most valuable Fragment of *Abydenus*, which gives the greatest Light to this perplexed Part of ancient History and Chronology, which could never have been cleared up without it. *Abydenus* related from *Berosus*, or the *Chaldean* Annals, that *Belus* was succeeded in the *Babylonian* Empire by his Son *Babius*; after *Babius* reigned his Son *Anebis*; after *Anebis* his Son *Chæalus* or *Chalaus*; after *Chæalus*, *Arbelus*; and after *Arbelus* or *Ara-belus* reigned *Ninus*: So that there were four Reigns between *Belus* and *Ninus*. *Moses Chorenensis* has set down a second *Arbelus* by Mistake; for there is but one in *Africanus*, who must have had these Kings from *Abydenus*. The only Mistake of *Abydenus* (which seems to have been his own Conjecture) is, that he made *Arbelus* the Father of *Ninus*; as *Cyril* (56) of *Alexandria* saies also that he did: but *Ctesias* and most of the ancient Writers agree that *Ninus* was an *Assyrian*, and conquered the Kingdom of *Babylon*, and added it to the *Assyrian* Empire. The Account of the above Succession of *Babylonian* Kings between *Belus* and *Ninus* is confirmed by a contemporary Succession of *Armenian* Kings between *Haic*, the first King of *Armenia* who slew *Belus* in Battle, and *Aram* who was the sixth in Descent from him, and contemporary with *Ninus*. *Abydenus* (57) has given us this Succession preserved also in *Moses Chorenensis*; and *Maribas* (58) of *Catina* in *Syria*

(55) Hist. Armen. lib. i. c. 4. p. 12, 13.

(56) Cont. Jul. lib. i. p. 10.

(57) Hist. Armen. p. 12, 13, 15, 24, 36.

(58) About the Year before Christ, 130, *Maribas* was sent by *Valarsaces* King of *Armenia* to his Brother *Arfaces* the second, King of *Parthia*, who then reigned over the *Assyrian* Empire, with a Letter to desire him to give him Access to the royal Library at *Nineveh*, that he might transcribe from the *Assyrian* Records the History of the *Armenian* Kings. In searching the Library, *Maribas* found a Book which contained the History of the most ancient *Asiatic* Kings. This Book, as appeared from an Inscription at the Beginning of it, was by the Command of *Alexander the Great*, translated out of the *Chaldean* Tongue into *Greek*, [which shewed that the History it contained was extracted from the *Assyrian* Records at *Nineveh*] and deposited in the Royal Library [by Order more probably of *Seleucus*, and not of *Alex-*
before

before him had the same Genealogy of *Armenian* Kings to *Ninus* taken from the *Assyrian* Records at *Nineveh*.

The two Genealogies were as follows.

<i>Babylonian</i> Kings from <i>Abydenus</i> .	<i>Armenian</i> Kings from <i>Maribas</i> and <i>Abydenus</i> .
1. <i>Belus</i> (of <i>Ham's</i> Line)	1. <i>Haic</i> (of <i>Japhet's</i> Line)
2. <i>Babius</i>	2. <i>Armenacus</i>
3. <i>Anebis</i>	3. <i>Aramæis</i> or <i>Armæis</i>
4. <i>Chæalus</i>	4. <i>Amasia</i>
5. <i>Arbelus</i>	5. <i>Gelamius</i>
6. <i>Ninus</i>	6. <i>Harma</i>
	7. <i>Aram</i>

There are seven Generations in the *Armenian* Genealogy, and but six in the *Babylonian*; which shews that the Reigns of the *Babylonian* Kings were longer than those of the *Armenian* Kings. The four Kings above mentioned who reigned at *Babylon* between *Belus* and *Ninus* are both misplaced and the Order of them inverted in (59) *Synander* who never was at *Nineveh*] *Maribas* wrote out of this Book in *Syriac* and *Greek* what related to the History of the *Armenian* Kings from *Haic* and *Belus* King of *Babylon* down to the Reign of *Sardanapalus*, and lower; and presented his Book to *Valarsaces* King of *Armenia*, who laid it up in his Palace at *Nisibis*. Hist. Armen. lib. i. c. 8.

Maribas mentioned the *Babylonian* King *Belus* who was contemporary with *Haic* who slew him; and all the *Assyrian* Kings from *Ninus* who were mentioned in the *Armenian* History, and with whose Reigns the *Armenian* History was connected, but none else; on which Account *Maribas* had not an entire Catalogue of all the *Assyrian* Kings, but only those recited in the *Armenian* History, which *Moses* adapted to the *Armenian* Præfects, who were constituted in their Reigns. From the History of *Maribas* it appears that *Nineveh* after the Destruction of it by the *Medes* and *Babylonians*, so as to be no more the Seat of the *Assyrian* Empire, was restored to some Degree of Eminency; and that the *Assyrian* Records were still kept in a royal Library there. See *Arrian*. de reb. Ind. p. 588. *Ptolemy's* Geography, p. 146, 206. *Tacit*. Annal. lib. xii. c. 13. *Ammian*. Marcellin. lib. xxiii. c. 20. who mention *Nineveh* as a City in their Days, but nothing like in Grandeur to what it had been.

(59) Chronograph. p. 151 — 155.

cellus from *Africanus*, in an unaccountable Manner: they are the 29th, 30th, 31st, and 32^d Kings in his Catalogue. *Africanus* misplaced them from a wrong Conceit that *Ninus* was the Son of *Belus*: but the inverted Order may be the Error of *Syncellus*. However we are greatly beholden to *Africanus* for giving us the Years of the Reigns of these Kings, which were not set down in the Fragment preserved by *Moses Chorenensis*, but the bare Genealogy only which is of inestimable Value.

Babius reigned 37 Years; after him *Anebis* reigned 38 Years; *Chæalus* or *Cbalaus* reigned after *Anebis* 45 Years; and after him *Arbelus* or *Arabelus* reigned 42 Years; in all they are 162 Years. And as *Belus* reigned 55 Years before these four Kings, it is evident that 217 Years passed between *Belus* and *Ninus*. And as it has been before shewn from the Years of the *Chaldaean* and *Arabian* Dynasties, that *Belus* who succeeded the last *Arabian* King began to reign at *Babylon* in the Year before *Christ* 2233, it follows from the preceding Computation that *Ninus* began to reign at *Babylon* in the Year before *Christ* 2016. And this I take to be the fixed and most certain Epoch of the *Babylonian* Empire from *Belus*, and of the *Affyrian* Empire which succeeded it and began with *Ninus*.

We can have no better Evidence of the true Chronology and Antiquities of the *Babylonian* and *Affyrian* Empires than what has been given. *Abydenus* was an Historian of undoubted Credit: he had seen the History of *Berosus*, and also consulted the *Chaldaean* Annals; and the *Affyrian* Records of the Kings of *Armenia* kept at *Nineveh*, an Extract of which *Maribas* of *Catina* found there transcribed, and translated out of *Chaldee* into *Greek*, agreed entirely with *Abydenus*: and perhaps *Abydenus* took the *Armenian* Kings from *Maribas*. And *Maribas* having found *Haic* the first King of *Armenia*, to be contemporary with *Belus* at *Babylon*, and also that *Aram*, the seventh King of *Armenia*, was contemporary with *Ninus*, it was thence evident that there had been at *Babylon* several intervening Reigns between *Belus* and *Ninus* which were mentioned by *Abydenus*.

These Reigns were not set down in the *Affyrian* Records of the *Armenian* History, because nothing remarkable had happened after
the

the Reign of *Belus* the *Babylonian* King, who was slain by *Haic*. The *Armenians* lived in Peace from that Time till the Reign of *Aram*, who was a great Warrior, and enlarged the Kingdom of *Armenia* by his Conquests, before *Ninus* reigned at *Nineveh*. The *Assyrians* till then had no Kings, but lived under the primitive patriarchal Government of Heads of Families, which continued longer amongst them who were Descendants of *Sem*, than it had done at *Babylon*, *Egypt*, and *Phœnicia*, amongst the Posterity of *Ham*: and *Ninus* was the first who set up an absolute monarchical Government or Tyranny over the *Assyrians*. Hence we see that *Ctesias* could go no higher than *Ninus* in his History of the *Assyrian* Kings, there being no Mention of any before him in the *Assyrian* Records: and he could know nothing of the *Babylonian* Kings before his Reign, except only of *Belus* who was mentioned in the *Armenian* History, because the *Assyrians* had no Wars or Intercourse with the *Babylonians* before *Ninus* invaded and conquered them. So that the *Assyrian* History of *Ctesias* has been misrepresented, and undervalued by some learned Men altogether without Cause. We are obliged to him for the Account of the *Assyrian* Kings, and the Years of their several Reigns and the Duration of the *Assyrian* Empire to the Time of the Revolt of the *Medes*. And the Names of many of the *Assyrian* Kings which have been objected to, and some have weakly thought to have been feigned by *Ctesias*, are confirmed by the *Armenian* History of *Maribas*, who without any Variation, except in two or three Reigns, gives them the same Names that they had in *Ctesias*; and therefore there can be no Doubt but that *Ctesias* wrote them from the *Assyrian* Records.

It was very preposterous in *Africanus* to place the four *Babylonian* Kings who reigned before *Ninus*, in the *Ctesian* Catalogue of *Assyrian* Kings which he knew began with *Ninus*. The Absurdity of this Interpolation was visible to every one. All knew that *Ctesias* had no more than 36 Kings, and their Names were well known: but the Addition of these Kings made them 40. *Ctesias* therefore knew nothing of these Kings, nor found any such in the *Assyrian* Annals, wherein all the Kings were recorded. They are also inconsistent

with the Relations of *Ctesias*, that *Troy* was taken in the Reign of *Teutamus* the 26th King, but by the Infertion of the four Kings the taking of it is carried down about 170 Years lower than his Reign: with his Relation also, that the *Assyrians* had then reigned in *Asia* a thousand Years and something more, but by the Account of *Africanus* they had reigned more than 1100 Years; also, that the whole Duration of the *Assyrian* Empire was something more than 1300 Years; but *Africanus* made it 1460 Years. He ought therefore either to have rejected entirely the four Kings above-mentioned, or to have put them in their proper Places between *Belus* and *Ninus*. *Eusebius* was certainly in the right in omitting them in his Catalogue of the *Assyrian* Kings, though *Scaliger* blames him for so doing, as if it was to serve the Hypothesis of his own Chronology. But as *Eusebius* began his Chronicon with *Ninus*, he must necessarily omit the four Kings who preceded his Reign; and if *Scaliger* had known the true Place of these Kings which he found in *Africanus*, and that they were *Babylonian* and not *Assyrian* Kings, he would not have censured *Eusebius* for omitting them, but *Africanus* for adding them in the *Ctesian* Catalogue, to which they could not possibly belong. *Eusebius* indeed was to blame in following the Conceit of *Africanus* that *Ninus* began to reign in the 28th Year of *Terab* the Father of *Abraham*; and so that *Abraham* was born in the 43^d Year of his Reign; whereby he placed *Ninus*, according to his reckoning of the Time of the Birth of *Abraham*, in the Year before *Christ* 2058, which was 42 Years too high: and *Africanus* placed him many Years higher in Consequence of his carrying the Birth of *Abraham* many Years higher than *Eusebius* did. *Eusebius* (60) indeed placed *Ninus* 69 Years lower than *Ctesias* did, and to mend the Matter took a most unwarrantable Liberty to shorten the Times of the Reigns of the *Assyrian* Kings sixty Years or more, to suit them to his Scripture-Scheme of Chronology; and to bring them to the Period where he thought they ended, in both which he was greatly mistaken. In these Things he was truly to blame, and his Management has embarrassed all Chronologers ever since.

(60) Animadv. in Euseb. Chron. p. 14, 15.

As *Abydenus's* Account of the four *Babylonian* Kings between *Belus* and *Ninus* may be depended upon, and is confirmed by the Annals of the *Armenian* Kings : so the Mistake of making *Ninus* the Son of *Belus* might easily proceed from his succeeding *Arbelus* in the *Chaldæan* or *Babylonian* Empire ; though he was not his Son, but King of *Affyria*, who conquered and slew *Arbelus*, and joined the *Babylonian* Empire to the *Affyrian*.

From the foregoing Observations it appears that after the Reigns of the six *Arabian* Kings over *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa*, *Belus* and four of his Posterity reigned at *Babylon* before *Ninus* conquered it, and annexed it to the *Affyrian* Empire. Therefore the Catalogue of *Africanus* in *Syncellus* ought to be corrected, and to proceed as follows, viz.

The second Babylonian Dynasty of five Kings which lasted 217 Years.

1. *Belus* reigned 55 Years (61) in the Year of the World 3193, and in the Year before *Christ*, 2233.
2. *Babius* his Son — 37 Years, in the Year of the World 3248, and in the Year before *Christ*, 2178.
3. *Anebis* his Son — 38 Years, in the Year of the World 3285, and in the Year before *Christ*, 2141.

(61) The old *Latin* Chronicle in *Scaliger's* Edition of the *Chronicon* of *Eusebius* p. 74. gives to *Belus* 62 Years. But I take the Number 55 to be right. *Belus* having recovered the *Babylonian* Kingdom from the *Arabians*, repaired *Babylon*, and raised and finished the Tower which was first built by the Posterity of *Noah* above 400 Years before, and left unfinished by their Dispersion. He probably walled the City about to prevent the Incurſion of the *Arabians*. His Tower or Temple was in the middle of the City, and was of a square pyramidical Form, and made of Brick ; of the Height of a Stadium, or 600 Feet : and every Side also was a Stadium. *Strab. Geog. lib. 16. p. 1073.* *Belus* was buried in this Tower, and was deify'd after his Death, and worshiped in it, and the *Chaldeans* made their astronomical Observations from the Top of it. *Herodotus* describes it lib. i. c. 181, 182, 183. and *Diod. Sic. lib. ii. p. 123.* See *Prideaux Connect. Vol. 1st. p. 193.* and Notes. *Bochart. Canaan. lib. iv. c. 15. Plin. Hist. Nat. lib. vi. c. 26. Solin. c. 60. Arrian. Expedit. Alex. lib. iii. p. 196. and lib. vii. p. 480. Pausan. Attic. p. 15. Arcadic. p. 264.*

4. *Chæatus* his Son — 45 Years, in the Year of the World 3323, and in the Year before *Christ* 2103.

5. *Arbelus* his Son — 42 Years, in the Year of the World 3368, and in the Year before *Christ*, 2058.

Arbelus was the last *Titanian* King of *Babylon* who was conquered and slain by *Ninus* King of *Assyria*, as *Diodorus Siculus* relates from *Ctesias*. And the *Babylonian* Kingdom, which was the first after the Flood, and had continued for 622 Years from *Nimrod* the Founder of it, was destroyed, and subjected to the *Assyrian* Empire in the Year of the World 3410, and in the Year before *Christ* 2016, whence the Reign of *Ninus* commenced at *Babylon*, over which he reigned 52 Years.

The Reign of *Ninus* and the *Assyrian* Empire in the lower *Asia*, may be ascertained from the History of the *Shepherd* Kings in *Egypt*; and of *Moses* concerning *Abraham's* defeating *Chederlaomer* King of *Elam*, with his three confederate Kings, related in the 14th Chapter of the Book of *Genesis*.

Manetbo in his *Egyptian* History (62) related, that, when the Army of the *Shepherds* from *Phœnicia* invaded and conquered *Egypt*, and made *Salatis*, their Leader, King, he fixed his Seat at *Memphis*, and put Garisons in the most convenient Places: but he fortified most strongly the Eastern Parts of the Country [i. e. towards *Arabia* and *Chaldæa*] as foreseeing that the *Assyrians*, who were then grown potent, would sometime be inclined to invade the Kingdom of *Egypt*. He therefore repaired a City called by the *Egyptians* *Abaris*, and afterwards *Sin* or *Pelusium*, situated upon the *Nile* at the Entrance into *Egypt*; and built a very strong Wall about it, and placed in it a Garison of two hundred and forty thousand Men, as a Security against any Invasion that might be made upon *Egypt* by the *Assyrians*.

Now the *Shepherds* invaded *Egypt*, as will hereafter appear from the Dynasties of *Manetbo*, in the Year before *Christ* 1982: So the *Assyrians* under *Ninus* had conquered *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa* about 34 Years before; and might easily have passed through *Arabia* into *Egypt*. This made them afraid of the *Assyrians* who were grown pow-

(62) Apud Joseph. cont. Apion. lib. i. Sect. 14, p. 445.

erful in the lower *Asia*; and therefore they fortified the Eastern Parts of *Egypt*, which were most exposed to be invaded by them.

Hence it appears that the *Assyrians* were grown potent in *Asia* by their Conquests of *Babylonia*, *Chaldæa*, and the neighbouring Countries; though they had not conquered *Arabia*, when *the Shepherds* from *Phœnicia* invaded and conquered *Egypt* in the 35th Year of the Reign of *Ninus*. But that *Ninus* had not conquered *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa* before the Year before *Christ* 2016, is to be proved from the History of *Moses*.

We read *Gen. xiv. 1.* that *Amraphel* was King of *Shinar* or *Babylonia* five or six Years after *Abraham* was come into the Land of *Canaan*, which was in the Year before *Christ* 2023, when *Arbel* or *Arabel* reigned at *Babylon*; and was probably the *Amraphel* of *Moses*. *Arioch* was at the same Time King of *Ellasar* (63) or *Arabia*; *Chedorlaomer* was King of *Elam*, the Country between *Persia* and *Babylon*, which comprehended *Sufiana*, *Dan. viii. 2.* and *Tidal* was King of *Nations*: that is, he ruled over several Cities, and Sorts of People in *Cæle-Syria*, or the Parts thereabout, in *Canaan*. This seems to be the Explanation of the *Samaritan* Version, which calls *Tidal* the King who was Ruler over the *Chamians* or Descendants of *Cham* or *Ham*; and so probably meant the *Canaanites*, or they might be a mixed People in *Mesopotamia*.

These Kings & 2. etc. are said to have assisted *Chedorlaomer* in a War with *Bera* King of *Sodom*, and *Birsha* King of *Gomorrhah*, and *Shinab* King of *Admah*, and *Shemeber* King of *Zeboim*, and the King of *Bela* which is *Zoar*, who had been twelve Years subject to *Chedorlaomer*, but in the thirteenth they rebelled and refused to pay him Tribute. After *Chedorlaomer* and the Kings his Allies, had subdued the five rebellious Kings, they plundered *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah*; and amongst the

(63) *Arioch* King of *Ellasar* was probably *Ariæus* King of *Arabia*, who assisted *Ninus* in his Conquest of *Babylon*, as observed above. *Ptolemy* mentions a People of *Arabia* called *Elisari*, *Geog. lib. vi. c. 7.* and *Stephanus De Urb.* mentions a City called *Ellas* in *Cæle-Syria* on the Borders of *Arabia*: or it may be *Thelassar* or *Telassar* a City of *Mesopotamia* on the Border of *Babylonia*, as *Jonathan Ben Uzziel* understands it; and which is mentioned *Isai. xxxvii. 12.*

Captives

Captives carried away *Lot* the Nephew of *Abraham*, with all his Goods. A Person who had escaped out of *Sodom* immediately went to *Hebron*, and informed *Abraham* that *Lot* was taken Captive by the confederate Kings. Whereupon he forthwith armed his Servants who were three hundred and eighteen, and *Mamre* the *Amorite*, and his two Brothers, *Eschol* and *Aner*, joined him with their Servants, and they pursued after the Kings unto *Dan*, where coming upon them in different Quarters, by Surprise in the Night, when they were unarmed and asleep, *Abraham* routed them, and put them to Flight, and recovered and brought back to *Sodom* his Nephew *Lot*, and all the Captives and Goods which had been taken thence. And after he had given his Allies, *Aner*, *Eschol*, and *Mamre*, their Share of the Booty, he restored all the rest to the King of *Sodom*. But he offered the Tythes of all that he had gotten from the conquered Kings for an eucharistical Sacrifice to God who had blessed him with Victory; and these he delivered to *Melchizedek* King of *Salem*, who was a Priest of the most high God: and had come to congratulate him upon his Success, *ŷ* 18, 20. After *Melchizedek* had pronounced a Blessing upon *Abraham* from the most high God, it is added *ŷ* 20. *and he gave him Tythes of all*: that is, of the Spoil which he had taken from the confederate Kings, *ŷ* 16. An unlearned Reader, perceiving *Melchizedek* to be the Person immediately speaking before, might think that he who gave Tythes was not *Abraham*, but that *Melchizedek* gave them to *Abraham*. But it is certain that *Abraham* was the Person who gave Tythes to *Melchizedek*, as an Offering to God who had blessed his Arms with Success. And the original and true Reading of the Text is, *and Abraham gave him Tythes of all*. Thus the *Hebrew* Copy of *Josephus* had it, and thus the most ancient *Vatican Greek* Copy has it, and the *Complutense* also, and other Copies, and the *Paschal Chronicle*: and this Reading and Sense is confirmed by *St. Paul*, *Heb.* vii. 4. From the foregoing History it is evident, that the *Assyrians* at this Time possessed but a small (64) Part of the upper *Asia*; and had made no Conquests on this Side the *Euphra-*

(64) Ἡ μὲν γὰρ Ἀσσυρίων ἀρχὴ παλαιὰ τις ἦτα, καὶ εἰς τὰς μυθικὰς ἀναγομένη γένεσις, εὐχρηστὸς τοῖς ἱεροῦστοις Ἀσίου μέγιστος. *Dionys. Halicarnas. Antiq. Rom. lib. i. p. 2. edit. Francof. 1586.*

tes. The four confederate Kings above-mentioned were all independent Rulers in their several Territories of *Elam*, *Babylonia*, *Chaldæa*, *Arabia*, and *Cæle-Syria*: and of these the King of *Elam* was most potent, and had extended his Dominion beyond the *Euphrates* as far as *Sodom* and *Gomorrab*, whose Kings with three others of the neighbouring Cities he had conquered and made tributary. No King of *Assyria* is in the least taken Notice of; and we may with Certainty conclude that the *Assyrian* Empire did not yet exist in the lower *Asia*; or was extended into *Persia* or *Elam*, and *Babylonia*, which had no Kings of their own after they were conquered and made subject to the Kings of *Assyria*; but were then governed by tributary Princes or Præfects under the Kings of *Assyria*. But it is observable that after *Amraphel* and *Chedorlaomer* we hear no more in Scripture of any Kings of *Shinar* or *Babylon*, or *Elam* or *Persia*, for many Ages. The Reason is, that about two Years after the preceding War, the *Assyrians* under *Ninus* conquered *Persia* or *Elam*, *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa*, and thenceforth they became tributary Provinces to the Kings of *Assyria*.

Now from the History of *Abraham's* defeating the confederate Kings we shall find that the *Assyrian* Empire under *Ninus* commenced about the Year before *Christ* 2016, as I have stated it. *Abraham* was born in the sixth Year of *Chæalus*, the fourth *Babylonian* King after *Belus*, and in the Year before *Christ* 2098. He went from *Haran* into the Land of *Canaan*, when he was 75 Years of Age, in the Year before *Christ* 2023. The next Year he went into *Egypt* on Account of a Famine being in *Canaan*; and returned after he had staid a Year or less, in the Year before *Christ* 2021, when *Lot* and he parted; and *Lot* possessed the plain Country in which *Sodom* stood, and dwelt with his Family in that City: and *Abraham* went and dwelt at *Hebron*. Two or three Years after this, if not sooner, and about the Year before *Christ* 2019 or 2018, happened the Battle between the five Kings of *Sodom*, *Gomorrab*, and three neighbouring Cities, and the four Kings of *Shinar*, *Elam*, and the Countries adjacent, whom *Josephus* calls *Assyrians*, and supposeth them to be Præfects only of several Provinces under the King of the *Assyrians*, who at that Time, he saies, (65) were *Masters of A-*

(65) Κατ' ἐκείνον τὸ καιρὸν Ασσυρίων καρχέντων τῆς Ἀσίας. Antiq. Jud. lib. i. c. 9.
Asia.

Asia. *Josepbus* was led into this Mistake by *Ctesias* placing the Reign of *Ninus*, and the *Assyrian* Empire many Years too high. Had this been so, *Moses* would have said, that the five Kings had served, not *Chederlaomer* King of *Elam* but, the King of *Assyria* twelve Years, and that in the thirteenth Year they rebelled against the King of *Assyria*, and that he sent four of his Generals, not the Kings of *Elam*, *Sbinar*, etc. to quell their Rebellion, and bring them under Subjection and Obedience. And had the *Assyrians* been then Masters of *Asia*, or of the Kingdoms of *Elam*, *Babylonia*, and *Chaldæa*, etc. they would soon with a powerful Army have revenged the Defeat and Slaughter of their Subjects upon *Abraham* and his Allies. It is therefore certain that they had not then made any Conquests beyond the Bounds of *Assyria*, or had passed the *Euphrates* with an Army. So that the Reign of *Ninus*, or his Conquests in *Elam*, *Babylonia*, and *Chaldæa* could not commence before the Time I have fixed it both from the *Chaldean* and *Assyrian* Annals, which entirely agree with the History of Scripture.

The *Babylonians* from the Reign of *Belus* had been engaged in many Wars with the neighbouring States all round them; and therefore their Country was not so populous as *Assyria*; and the *Elamites* in their Wars also, and by their Defeat by *Abraham* and his Allies were much weakened: but the *Assyrians* had enjoyed Peace and Liberty for many Ages, and so their Country was full of Inhabitants; and therefore *Ninus* easily raised a very numerous Army, sufficient to make the Conquest which he did both in the upper and lower *Asia*. *Ninus* was young when he began to reign, and being of a very warlike Disposition with which he had animated the Youth of his Kingdom, he may well be supposed to have conquered many Countries in the Space of seventeen Years, in all which Time he was engaged in Wars, as (66) *Ctesias* related. His first Conquests seem to have been in the lower *Asia*; in subduing *Persia*, *Babylonia*, and *Chaldæa*, as *Ctesias* related. After which he invaded *Armenia*, which submitted and became tributary

(66) *Diod. Sic. lib. ii. p. 114, 115.*

to him with *Cappadocia*, and the Country of *Pontus* and *Media*, which had been a few Years before conquered by (67) *Aram*, King of *Armenia*, and added to that Kingdom. It is also probable that he subdued several Countries of the North East Parts of *Asia*, and beyond the *Caspian* Sea; as *Parthia*, *Bactria*, and others mentioned by *Ctesias*. But then *Ctesias* was mistaken in relating that *Ninus* conquered *Phœnicia*, *Cœle-Syria*, *Egypt*, and most of the lesser *Asia* as far as the *Hellepont*. It is evident from Scripture, that the upper and lower *Syria* and *Mesopotamia* were governed by their own Kings many Ages after *Ninus*: nor did the *Assyrians* ever conquer *Egypt*, *Phœnicia*, or the lesser *Asia*.

The Conquests of *Ninus* were chiefly in the upper *Asia*, but in the lower he carried his Arms no farther than *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa*. On this Account *Ctesias* is charged with giving romantic Relations of the Conquests of *Ninus* and his Queen *Semiramis* who succeeded him in the *Assyrian* Empire; and without Doubt he has ascribed to them Exploits which belonged to much later *Assyrian* and *Babylonian* Kings and Queens. But yet *Ctesias* is not so much to be blamed as he has been; and in the main was a faithful Historian. His Case seems to have been this, viz. he found that the *Assyrian* Empire had been extended so far as he related, except the lesser *Asia*. All the upper and lower *Asia* had been subject to it; and the *Assyrian* Kings had made Conquests in both the *Syrias*, and in *Judæa*; and had carried their Arms as far as *Egypt*. Now finding that the *Assyrian* Records mentioned no Kings after *Ninus* and *Semiramis*, who had made any Conquests to enlarge the *Assyrian* Empire, but that most of them to *Sardanapalus*, had lived in Luxury and Voluptuousness, and gave themselves up to Ease and Pleasure, and supposing that the *Assyrian* Empire was destroyed in his Reign by the *Medes* and *Babylonians*, he ascribed the entire Greatness of the *Assyrian* Empire to the Conquests of *Ninus* and *Semiramis*: and as he had placed *Sardanapalus* above an hundred Years too high, there were no *Assyrian* Kings before that Time, to whom he could ascribe the Conquest of the *Syrias*, *Judæa*, and *Phœ-*

(67) Mos. Choren. Hist. Armen. lib. i. p. 36, 37, 38, 39.

Asia in the lower *Asia*, and also of *Egypt*. All these Conquests were made by *Affyrian* Kings who lived after the Time when he thought the *Affyrian* Empire was destroyed: and were not to be found in the *Median* Annals of the Præfects whom he supposed to have reigned over the *Affyrian* Empire. This was the Misfortune of *Ctesias* in carrying the Reign of *Ninus* so many Years too high; and this seems to have been the Ground of his Mistakes. He would not feign Actions to be done by those Kings to whom he found none ascribed in the *Affyrian* Annals: and, therefore, to account for the Extent of the *Affyrian* Empire, he was under a Sort of Necessity of amplifying the Conquests of *Ninus* and *Semiramis*. But his Observation that the *Affyrian* Kings after *Ninus* and *Semiramis* did nothing memorable, but lived at *Nineveh* altogether (68) in Ease and Voluptuousness, is true in Respect of many of them, and is both agreeable to the Relation of *Herodotus*, and to the Scripture-History of the *Syrian* Kingdoms in the Times of *David*, *Solomon*, and many Years after.

The *Affyrians* in the Reigns of *Ninus* and *Semiramis* had not conquered all the upper *Asia*, nor seem to have extended their Kingdom farther on the North West Parts of *Asia* than to *Armenia*, and in the lower *Asia* to have proceeded no farther than *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa*. The following Kings for many Ages did nothing; and *Herodotus* (69) saies that the *Affyrians* had ruled over the upper *Asia* no longer than 520 Years before the Revolt of the *Medes*. So that if *Armenia* was the Boundary of the *Affyrian* Empire on the North West Part of the upper *Asia*, the *Affyrian* Kings after *Ninus* and *Semiramis* had done nothing for about 600 Years; and were not Masters of *Pontus* and *Capadocia* the farthest Kingdoms of the upper *Asia* as far as the River *Hælys*, which with Mount *Taurus* was the Western Boundary of the upper *Asia*. And though the *Affyrians* reigned over all the upper *Asia* from the Year before *Christ* 1231, which was 520 Years before the Revolt of the *Medes*, yet they had not then, nor till the Days of *Pul*, carried their Arms into *Syria* and *Judæa*, which was not till the Year before *Christ* 770.

(68) Diod. Sic. lib. ii. p. 134, 135.

(69) Ασυρίαν ἀρχόντων τὴν ἀνω Ἀσίαν ἕως ἕτα εἰκοσι καὶ πεντακόσια πρῶτοι ἀπ' αὐτῶν Μῆδοι ἤρξαντο ἀπιστάσαι. Lib. i. c. 96.

Herodotus is a faithful Historian, and may be relied on; and though *Ctesias* differed from him in this Account, yet *Ctesias's* own Relation of the Indolence and Inactivity of the *Assyrian* Kings after *Ninus* and *Semiramis* does greatly favour the Account of *Herodotus*: and does farther give great Light to the History of Scripture. As the *Assyrians* were Masters of *Babylon* and *Chaldæa*, and also of *Armenia* from the Time of *Ninus*, it seems unaccountable that they should not have conquered *Mesopotamia*, and the upper and lower *Syria* in so many Centuries, as we find from Scripture that they had not. But the Account of *Ctesias* clears up the Truth of the Matter, though it occasioned him to fall into several great Mistakes. And we may also hereby observe and admire the Providence of God, that the *Assyrians* made no farther Progress than they did in so many Years: by which Means the Promises of God to the Seed of *Abraham* were fulfilled, that they should possess all the Countries from the River of *Egypt* and the Western Sea, to the River *Euphrates*, *Gen. xv. 18. Deut. xi. 24. Jos. i. 4.* These Promises were fully completed by the Conquests of *Saul* and *David*, *2 Chron. ix. 26.* without any Interruption from the Kings of *Assyria*, whose Hands and Power God had restrained. But when the Kingdoms of *Israel* and *Judah* were divided, and the People of both, and more especially of *Israel*, were grown very wicked, and had forsaken the Worship of the true God: then God stirred up against them the Kings of *Assyria*, who invaded and laid waste their Country, made them tributary, and carried away ten Tribes captive into *Assyria*.

Having from the Annals of the *Babylonian* Kings, and also from those of the *Armenian* Kings, and from the Scripture-History of *Abraham*, and other Observations, fixed the true Epoch of the Reign of *Ninus*, and of the *Assyrian* Empire, I shall set down again the Reigns of the *Assyrian* Kings in their true Time, and make some Observations on them.

A Catalogue of the 36 Assyrian Kings from Ninus to Sardanapalus.

	<i>Years of Reign.</i>		<i>Year of the World.</i>		<i>Year before Christ.</i>
1. <i>Ninus</i> (70)	— 52	—	3410	—	2016
2. <i>Semiramis</i> (71)	— 42	—	3462	—	1964

(70) Before *Ninus* built *Nineveh* he resided at *Telane*, which was the most ancient City of *Syria* or *Assyria*, as *Stephanus* of *Byzantium* saies in *Voc.* But after he had spent 17 Years in Wars, and added many conquered Provinces to the *Assyrian* Empire, he built *Nineveh*, and made it large enough to be the royal Seat of so great an Empire. It was undoubtedly the greatest City then in the World. *Diodorus Siculus* lib. ii. p. 115. saies it was of an oblong Form: the two longer Sides being each an 150 Furlongs, and the other two which were lesser, each 90 Furlongs; and so the whole Compass was 480 Furlongs. The Wall was an hundred Feet in Height; and broad enough for three Chariots to drive abreast upon it. He built 1500 Towers in the City each 200 Feet high. *Diodorus* by Mistake saies this City was built upon the River *Euphrates*; but it was situated upon the *Tigris*, as *Herodotus*, *Ptolemy*, and *Pliny* agree. *Herodot.* lib. i. c. 193. and lib. ii. c. 150. *Ptolem.* Geog. p. 146. *Plin. Hist. Nat.* lib. vi. c. xiii. But *Pliny* was mistaken in saying it stood on the West Side of the *Tigris*, for it was on the East Side. This Mistake was probably owing to the new City called *Nineveh*, and since *Mosul*, which was built out of the Ruins of old *Nineveh*, and was situated on the West Side of the *Tigris*. *Strabo* Geog. lib. xvi. init. saies *Nineveh* was larger than *Babylon*. It was larger than *Babylon* was at first, whose Walls were only 360 Furlongs, as *Diodorus* from *Ctesias* relates: but *Nabuchadnezzar* enlarged it, and made the Walls equal in Circumference to those of *Nineveh*; and being a Square of 120 Furlongs on a Side, they made *Babylon* larger than *Nineveh*. See *Herodotus*, lib. i. c. 178. *Plin. Hist. Nat.* lib. vi. c. 26. The first Wall of *Babylon* was built by *Belus*, and was in Compass 360 Furlongs, to represent the Days of the old *Chaldean* Year: but *Nabuchadnezzar* built the outer Wall which was 480 Furlongs, *Herodot.* sup.

(71) *Ctesias* finding no King of *Assyria* who was related to have built *Babylon*, ascribed it to *Semiramis*, who was famous for many Structures which she raised, but did nothing at *Babylon* that we know of. *Berosus* exposed the Vanity of *Ctesias* and other *Greek* Historians, for ascribing the famous Buildings of *Babylon* to the *Assyrian Semiramis*, and assures us from the *Babylonian* Records that they were the Works of *Nabuchadnezzar*, as is related in the Prophet *Daniel*, ch. iv. v. 30. See *Jos. cont. Apion.* lib. i. Sect. 19, 20. and *Sibydenus* apud *Euseb. Præp. Evang.* lib. ix. c. 41. But *Moses Chorenensis* relates from *Maribas* of *Catina* that *Semiramis* built a City and a Palace in the most pleasant and fruitful Part of *Armenia*, whither she resorted to spend the Summer Season; and resided the rest of the Year at *Nineveh*, *Hist. Armen.*

3. *Ninyas*

	Years of Reign.	Year of the World.	Year before Christ.
3. Ninyas	38	3504	1922

lib. i. c. 15. This shews that she did not build either the Walls or Palace of *Babylon*, or ever lived in that City. And it does not appear that any of the Kings of *Assyria* ever lived at *Babylon*. *Semiramis*, as the same Author relates, ordered Pillars or Obelisks to be erected in many Places of *Armenia*, with Inscriptions engraved upon them to perpetuate the Memory of her Actions; and others to set forth the Boundaries of the several Provinces of the Country. These might give Occasion to *Ctesias* to relate that *Semiramis* brought to *Babylon* an Obelisk cut out of the Mountains of *Armenia*, which was 130 Feet in Height, and in Breadth and Thickness 25 Feet, which was esteemed to be one of the Wonders of the World, Diod. Sic. lib. ii. p. 125, 126. And the Palace which she built in *Armenia* might be the Ground of the Error of the Relation of *Ctesias*, that she built a Palace in *Ecbatana* the Capital of *Media*: for *Herodotus*, with far more Probability, tells us, that *Ecbatana* was built by *Dejoces*, the first King of the *Medes*, lib. i. c. 98. *Herodotus* mentions a Queen of *Babylon* called *Semiramis*, who enlarged the Walls and Temples of *Babylon*; and raised Banks all along the Plain of *Babylonia* to prevent the River from overflowing and drowning it. He adds, that she lived five Generations before *Nitocris*, who was by his Relation the Queen of *Nabuchadnezzar*; and therefore this *Semiramis* was most probably the Queen of *Nabonassar* who lived five Generations or 166 Years before *Nitocris* took the Government of *Babylon* upon her during the Madness of *Nabuchadnezzar*. See *Herodot.* lib. i. c. 184. *Eusebius* ascribes these Works to the first *Semiramis*, in *Chron.* p. 58. *Herodotus* also saies that one of the Gates of *Babylon* (which probably she built) was called the Gate of *Semiramis*, lib. iii. c. 155. *Herennius Philo* of *Byblus*, the Translator of *Sanchoniatho's Phœnician History*, saies, that *Babylon* was not built by *Semiramis*, as *Herodotus* related (who only saies that she improved the Buildings of it, lib. i. c. 184.) but by the Son of the most wise *Belus*, who lived 2000 Years before this *Semiramis*: *Eustathius* makes it no more than 1800 Years, from the same Author *Philo*, as is probable, though he does not mention him, *Com. in Dionys. Orb. Descript.* p. 183. and *V. Dionys.* 1006. According to the first Number, *Babylon* was built by *Nimrod*, called the Son of *Belus* by *Philo*, from *Sanchoniatho*, about the Year before Christ 2738, which is an hundred Years higher than I have placed it from the *Chaldean Annals* of *Berosus*: and by the latter Reading of *Philo* in *Eustathius*, it was built about the Year before Christ 2538, or an hundred Years lower than the true Year 2638 before the Christian Æra. See *Steph. Byzant.* voc. Βαβυλών. *Semiramis*, Queen of *Nabonassar*, lived in the Year before Christ 738. *Eusebius* places our *Semiramis* 800 Years before the Destruction of *Troy*, i. e. in the Year before Christ 1984. *Præp. Evang.* lib. x. c. 9. *Suidas*, from some unknown Author, relates, that our *Semiramis*, the first *Assyrian* Queen, walled

		Years of Reign.		Years of the World.		Years before Christ.
4. Arius (72)	————	30	————	3542	————	1884
5. Aralius	————	40	————	3572	————	1854
6. Xerxes (Balæus)	————	30	————	3612	————	1814
7. Armamitbres	—	38	————	3642	————	1784
8. Belockus	————	35	————	3680	————	1746
9. Balæus	————	52	————	3715	————	1711
10. Sethos (73) called Altadas		35	————	3767	————	1659

Nimrod about (and so saies Cyril, cont. Jul. lib. i. p. 10.) and called it *Babylon*: that she also erected Pyramids (as *Moses Chorenensis* relates) voc. *Semiramis*. The Truth is, *Nimrod*, with his Associates was the first proper Builder of *Babylon*: afterwards, as *Abydenus* relates from the *Chaldean* Records, it was walled about by *Belus*, who succeeded the *Arabian* Kings: and at last *Nabuchadnezzar* built new walls about it, with brazen Gates, and raised it to its highest Grandeur, *Dan.* iv. 30. Other Kings and Queens of *Babylon* before *Nabuchadnezzar*, as *Nabonasar* and his Queen *Semiramis*, improved and beautified what had been done before: but as the *Affyrian* Kings did not live there, it is not probable that they either built or added to the Greatness of it.

(72) *Africanus*, in *Syncellus*, p. 125. placed the *Argive* Æra, beginning with *Inachus*, in the Reign of *Arius* the fifth *Affyrian* King from *Belus*, and in the 200th Year of the *Affyrian* Empire. So by this reckoning it began in the 13th Year of the Reign of *Arius*, and in the Year before Christ 1872. *Eusebius* saies, in his *Præp. Evang.* lib. x. c. 9. p. 486. that *Inachus* began to reign at *Argos* when *Xerxes*, whom he calls the fifth King from *Semiramis*, began to reign in *Affyria*; and that this was 150 Years after the Beginning of the Reign of *Semiramis*: and so, by my Computation, it was in the Year before Christ 1814. and this may be the truest Epoch of the *Argive* Æra. But then *Eusebius* places *Semiramis* 800 Years before the Destruction of *Troy*, and so in the Year before Christ 1982, or 1983, and by this reckoning *Inachus* being placed 150 Years after her, will begin to reign in the Year before Christ 1832, or 1833. But in his *Chronicon* he places *Semiramis* 2004 Years before the Christian Æra. *Cassor* placed the Reign of *Inachus* in the Year before Christ 1870.

(73) This King is called *Altadas* by *Eusebius*, in his *Chronicon*; and by *Cassiodorus*; and *Azatagus* by *Moses Chorenensis*, from *Maribas* of *Catina*. *Cassiodorus*, in his *Chronicon*, placeth *Prometheus* in the Reign of this King: and he might live about the Year before Christ 1630. *Acusilaus*, in *Plato's Timæus*, cited by *Clem. Alexand.* in *Euseb. Præp. Evang.* lib. x. c. 12. and *Tatian*, *Orat. adv. Græc. fin.* make *Prometheus* and *Atlas* contemporaries with *Triopas* King of *Argos*, and so to live in the Year before Christ 1553. See *Clem. Alex. Strom.* i. p. 322. Edit. Paris.

	Years of Reign.	Years of the World.	Years before Christ.
11. <i>Mamytbus</i> (74)	30	3802	1624
12. <i>Ascalius</i> (75) or <i>Maschaleus</i>	30	3832	1594
13. <i>Sphærus</i>	28	3862	1564
14. <i>Mamylus</i> (76)	30	3890	1536
15. <i>Spartbæus</i> (77)	42	3920	1506
16. <i>Ascatades</i>	40	3962	1464
17. <i>Amyntes</i> (78)	50	4002	1424
18. <i>Belobus</i> [the second] (79)	25	4052	1374
19. <i>Baletores</i> or <i>Beletaras</i> (80)	34	4077	1349
20. <i>Lamprides</i>	37	4111	1315
21. <i>Sofares</i>	20	4148	1278
22. <i>Lampares</i>	30	4168	1258
23. <i>Panyas</i> (81)	45	4198	1228
24. <i>Sofarmus</i>	42	4243	1183
25. <i>Mithræus</i>	37	4285	1141
26. <i>Teutamus</i> , or <i>Tautanus</i>	32	4322	1104

(74) This King is called *Mamidas* by *Mos. Choren.* p. 53. *Mamithus* in *Pontacus's* MSS. of the *Chronicon* of *Eusebius*.

(75) *Syncellus* saies *Inachus* began to reign at *Argos* in the third Year of the Reign of this King, *Chronograph.* p. 124. But then by his Position of the *Assyrian* Kings too high, the third Year of *Ascalius* fell in the Year before *Christ* 1808. so that the Reign of *Inachus* is rightly enough placed in Time, though in a wrong Reign. See Not. 72. above. *Eusebius* calls him *Manchaleus* in his *Chronicon*.

(76) This King is called *Mamitus* by *Eusebius* in *Chron.* and *Samilus* by *Moses Chorenensis*.

(77) This King is called *Sparetus* by *Eusebius* in *Chron.* and *Spharctus* by *Moses Chorenensis*: *Cassiodorus*, in his *Chronicon*, places *Cecrops*, the first King of *Athens*, in his Reign, which shews that he fixed the *Æra* of the *Assyrian* Kings too high.

(78) This King is called *Amindes* by *Mos. Choren.*

(79) This King is called *Belleus* by *Agathias*; and *Belimus* by *Cephalion*, who saies that *Perseus*, the Son of *Danae* came into *Assyria* in his Reign, *Syncel.* p. 167. and his Expeditions are placed rightly here.

(80) This King is called *Vestascarus* by *Mos. Choren.*

(81) *Cephalion.* in *Syncel.* p. 167. saies that the *Argonaut* Expedition was in the Reign of *Panyas*. And it was about the fourth Year of his Reign, in the Year before *Christ* 1225. And the War of *Troy* was in his Reign also; but it was ended, and *Troy* taken in the first Year of *Sofarmus*.

27. *Teutæus*

		Years of Reign.		Years of the World.		Years before Christ.
27.	<i>Teutæus</i>	—	44	—	4354	— 1072
28.	<i>Tbineus</i>	—	30	—	4398	— 1028
29.	<i>Dercylus</i>	—	40	—	4428	— 998
30.	<i>Empacmes</i> (82)	—	38	—	4468	— 958
31.	<i>Laosthenes</i>	—	45	—	4506	— 920
32.	<i>Pertiades</i> (83)	—	30	—	4551	— 875
33.	<i>Opbratæus</i>	—	21	—	4581	— 845
34.	<i>Ephecheres</i> (84)	—	52	—	4602	— 824
35.	<i>Acraganes</i> (85)	—	42	—	4654	— 772
36.	<i>Tbonus Concolerus</i> , called <i>Sardanapalus</i>	} 20		—	4696	— 730

Total from *Ninus* to the End of *Sardanapalus*, in the Year before *Christ* 710 or 711, is 1305 Years.

Median Kings after *Thonus Concolerus*, from *Ctesias*.

		Years of Reign.		Years of the World.		Years before Christ.
1.	<i>Arbianes</i>	—	22	—	4716	— 710

In the first Year of this *Præfect*, or more truly in the preceding Year, which was before *Christ* 711, the *Medes* revolted, and set up a free Republican Government, which continued to the Reign of the following King, *Dejoces*.

2.	<i>Artæus</i> , or <i>Dejoces</i>	—	40	—	4738	— 688
3.	<i>Artynes</i> or <i>Pbraortes</i>	—	22	—	4778	— 648
4.	<i>Astibaras</i> or <i>Cyaxares</i>	—	40	—	4800	— 626
5.	<i>Astyigas</i> or <i>Astyages</i>	—	35	—	4840	— 586

(82) This King was probably called *Eupacmes* by *Africanus*, as *Scaliger* observes in his *Animadversions* on the *Chronicon* of *Eusebius*. He is called *Eupales* by *Eusebius* in his *Chronicon*; and *Eupalmus* by *Moses Chorenensis*.

(83) This King is called *Pyritiades* by *Eusebius* in his *Chronicon*; and *Pridiazes* by *Moses Chorenensis*.

(84) This King is called *Opbratenes* by *Eusebius* in his *Chronicon*.

(85) This King is called *Ocrzapæ* by *Eusebius* in his *Chronicon*; and *Acrasanes* by *Moses Chorenensis*. *Acrasapæ* is the true Name, in the *Chronicon* of *Eusebius*, as appears from the MS. of *Pontacus*.

The

The Sum total of the *Median* Kingdom after the Revolt from the *Affyrians* to the End of the Reign of *Astyages* is 159 Years to the Year before *Christ* 551, which is only one Year less than the true Sum ; if *Astyages* reigned, as is most probable, to the Year before *Christ* 550. And there seems to be an Error of one, if not two, Years in the Times of *Arbianes* and *Dejoces*, which ought to have a Year, if not two Years, more than they have. But I make no Hypotheses.

The Uses of the two foregoing Catalogues of the *Affyrian* Kings are very considerable in Chronology. By the first we see where *Ctesias* fixed the Epoch of the *Affyrian* Empire from *Ninus*, which all Chronologers have hitherto mistaken : but which is inferred with Certainty from the Years of the Reigns from *Ninus* to the *Median* Revolt, and from thence to *Astyages*. I have shewn that *Ctesias* placed *Ninus* too high by more than an hundred Years : this is evident from the *Chaldean* Records of the Years of the *Babylonian* Kings to the Time that he conquered *Babylon*. But *Ctesias* never saw the *Chaldean* Annals, nor knew any Thing of the Times of their Kings before *Ninus* : on which Account he was more liable to mistake in fixing the Epoch of the *Affyrian* Æra. Yet his Catalogue is of the greatest Service, as giving us the entire Term of the *Affyrian* Empire to the Revolt of the *Medes*, which otherwise we could not have known. Having Access to the royal Annals of the *Affyrian*, *Median*, and *Persian* Kings, he could not well mistake the Number of the Years of those Kings ; though by making some of the *Median* Præfects who were contemporary with the *Affyrian* Kings in whose Reigns they lived, to succeed them in the *Affyrian* Empire, he was forced to place *Ninus* above a Century too high. That great Mistake the Scripture-History enables us to rectify, which mentions several Kings of *Affyria* who ruled over *Media* and *Babylon* in the Times of those Præfects of *Media* whom he supposed to reign over the *Affyrian* Empire after the Dissolution of it : and if we had not had in the sacred Writings the Accounts and Times of those *Affyrian* Kings connected with the History of the *Jews*, and wrote by Persons of unquestionable Credit who lived at the Time of the Transactions mentioned in their Writings, we must have been greatly puzzled about the State of the *Affyrian* Empire for the Space of more than 200 Years ;

and one half of which Years has still perplexed all our Chronologers from the Time of *Eusebius* : and we must have relied on the Relations of *Herodotus* only, who appears to have known the Time of the *Median* Revolt, and also of the Dissolution of the *Affyrian* Empire by the taking of *Nineveh*, much better than *Ctesias* did; and agrees entirely with the Scripture-History. But yet we could not have known from *Herodotus* the entire Term of the *Affyrian* Empire to the *Median* Revolt; nor could we have fixed the exact Time either of that Revolt, or of the taking of *Nineveh*, and the Destruction of the *Affyrian* Empire without the Help of Scripture; though we know the one was a few Years before the Reign of *Dejoces*, and the other in the Reign of *Cyaxares*. But the Scripture-History enables us to fix both these Terms with great Exactness. Secondly,

The *Ctesian* Computation of the Times of the *Affyrian* Kings being by the Help of the *Chaldean* Annals fixed to its true Epoch or Beginning in the Reign of *Ninus*, which we have discovered from an invaluable Fragment of *Abydenus*, preserved by *Moses Chorenensis*, we find by the second Catalogue, that it brings us down exactly to the true Time of the *Median* Revolt upon the Death of *Senacherib*, and in the Beginning of the Reign of *Asar-Haddon*, as he is called both in Scripture and in the *Ptolemaic* Canon: so that we have Reason to depend upon the Years of the *Ctesian* Catalogue: and we cannot err more than about two Years.

Thomus Concolerus, whom *Ctesias* thought to be the King at whose Death the *Affyrian* Empire was destroyed by the *Medes* and *Babylonians*, could by his Reckoning be no other than *Senacherib* who was slain at *Nineveh* by two of his Sons, who were forced to flee into (86) *Armenia*, 2 *Kings* xix. v. 36, 37, and the Government was left to his youngest Son *Asar-Haddon*. *Senacherib* was hated by his Subjects for his Tyranny and Cruelty, and having lost in *Judæa* an Army of 185000 Men, who were slain in one Night by the *Angel of God*, as the Scripture

(86) *Scaordius* was Præfect of *Armenia*, when *Senacherib* was slain by his Sons, whom he secured in a Place near the Confines of *Affyria*. *Mos. Chor. Hist. Armen. lib. i. c. 22.*

relates,

relates, or by a Pestilence sent from God, as *Josephus* (87) from *Berosus* relates; and being slain soon after by his two eldest Sons, the whole Empire by these Disasters was thrown into Confusion: and this gave the *Medes* and *Babylonians* an Opportunity of revolting and gaining their Liberty.

It is certain that *Asar-Haddon* lost the *Median* Kingdom, and that *Dejoces* was King of the *Medes* in his Reign; and that the *Medes* were never after subject to the *Assyrians*. And it appears from the (88) History of *Judith*, and also from *Herodotus* that *Phraortes* Son of *Dejoces*, and second King of the *Medes*, called *Arphaxad* in the Book of *Judith*, was slain in Battle by the King of *Assyria* who is called *Nabuchodonosor*. It likewise appears from the *Ptolemaic* Canon that the *Babylonians* also had revolted from *Asar-Haddon*; and that he did not recover the Kingdom of *Babylon* till the 30th Year of his Reign at *Nineveh*, when he conquered it, and reigned there 13 Years. The short Reigns of the Kings of *Babylon* after the Death of *Senacherib* to the Conquest of it by *Asar-Haddon*, shew that it was unsettled and in great Confusion: for there were five Kings, and two Interregnums which lasted ten Years, in the Space of 29 Years. So that this remarkable Revolution and first Breach in the *Assyrian* Empire, may with the highest Probability be fixed to the Year before *Christ* 711. And as the *Medes* lived several Years in a State of Anarchy, as *Herodotus* tells us, before they chose *Dejoces* for their King, who had been several Years, by common Consent, an Arbitrator and Judge of all Differences arising amongst them, and was highly esteemed for his Justice and Integrity; it is hence plain that (89) *Diodorus Siculus* has placed his Reign too high, by fixing it to the second Year of the 17th Olympiad, or the Year before *Christ* 710, for which he alledges *Herodotus*, who saies no such Thing, nor could say it, as knowing nothing of reckoning by the Olympiads. The learned Archbishop *Usher* has followed this Error, and others after him: and *Eusebius* in his Chroni-

(87) *Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. i.*

(88) *Judith* ch. i. v. 1, 5, 15. *Herodot. lib. i. c. 102.*

(89) *Lib. ii. p. 146.* where by a gross Error *Dejoces* is twice called *Cyaxares*.

eon has placed it in the Year before *Christ* 707, by a somewhat less Error, into which he was forced by giving 54 Years to his Reign, instead of 40 which *Ctesias* gave him. It is true that *Herodotus* saies that *Dejoces* reigned 53 Years, which will bring the Beginning of his Reign to the first Year of the 19th Olympiad, and the Year before *Christ* 704, on which Account it is probable, that *Diodorus* referred to him as placing it thereabout. But this Number of Years carrying *Dejoces* so high, is evidently inconsistent with *Herodotus* saying immediately before, that the *Medes* after their Revolt lived several Years without a Governor, whilst *Dejoces* acted amongst them as a private Judge and Arbitrator, before they chose him to be their King: or else *Herodotus*, contrary to the Supposition of *Diodorus*, must place the Reign of *Dejoces* several Years lower than the 17th Olympiad, and then this will be inconsistent with the Years of the following Reigns, in which *Herodotus* agrees with *Ctesias*, and will bring the Reign of *Astyages* too low. So that the Number of the Years of the Reign of *Dejoces*, which *Ctesias* gave him, is far more probable than that of *Herodotus*. And by the *Ctesian* Catalogue *Dejoces* began to reign upon the Death of the last Præfect *Arbianes*, in the Year before *Christ* 688; which was 22 Years after the Revolt, or at lowest in the Year 687. This entirely agrees with what *Herodotus* relates of the *Medes* living several Years without a King after their Revolt; and alio with the Years of the following Reigns, which are the same both in *Ctesias* and *Herodotus*, and placeth the End of the *Median* Empire after the Reign of *Astyages*, where it is most probable it really ended, in the Year before *Christ* 550, as will be shewn hereafter; and Chronologers have erred about ten Years in their Computation.

Another Reason to infer that *Dejoces* reigned no more than 40 Years as *Ctesias* related, is, that by the Account of *Herodotus* himself, he must be advanced in Years before he was made King; having been for several Years before, by the unanimous Consent of the People made the Arbitrator and Judge of all their Differences. All these Things concur to confirm the Number of Years which *Ctesias* has given to his Reign.

Having fixed the Epoch or Beginning of the *Assyrian* Empire,
and

and shewn the Mistakes of *Ctesias* about it; and also his Error about the Revolt of the *Medes*, at which Time he thought *Nineveh* was taken and the *Assyrian* Empire destroyed, which I shall have Occasion to take farther Notice of hereafter; I shall proceed to confirm what I before have observed that the *Assyrian* Empire in the lower *Asia* did not extend farther than *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa* for many Ages after *Ninus*; and that the *Assyrian* Kings had made no Conquests in *Mesopotamia*, or on this Side the *Euphrates* in *Syria* and *Phœnicia*, till about 1246 Years after *Ninus* began to reign. We find in the History of Scripture that *Mesopotamia* and *Syria* had very anciently Kings of their own, who were powerful on this Side the River *Euphrates*: and we find in the same History when it was that these Countries became subject to the *Assyrian* Empire, and that they were not conquered or so much as invaded by the Kings of *Assyria*, till the Year before *Christ* 770.

We read in the Book of *Judges* (ch. iii. v. 8.) that *Chusan-Rishathaim* King of *Aram Nabaraim* or (90) *Mesopotamia*, conquered the *Israelites*, and held them in Bondage for eight Years. This was in the Year before *Christ* 1526. The Kings of *Assyria* were never called Kings of *Mesopotamia*; nor do we ever read of any King of *Mesopotamia* after the *Assyrians* had conquered that Country. This Kingdom of *Mesopotamian Syria* was afterward divided into many lesser Kingdoms, which became subject to the *Syrian* Kingdoms on this Side *Euphrates*, at *Zoba* and *Damascus*. These were the Kingdoms of *Aram Dammasek*, or *Syria Damascena*, between the Mountains *Libanus* and

(90) *Mesopotamia* was a Part of *Syria*. It is called *Padan Aram*, *Gen.* xxviii. v. 2. that is, the *Champaign Syria*, where *Laban* lived, who is called a *Syrian*, *Gen.* xxxi. 20. 24. And it is rendered in the *Greek Translation* *Μεσποταμία Συρίας*, i. e. *Mesopotamia of Syria*, *Gen.* xxviii. 7. xxxv. 9. and simply *Mesopotamia*, xxxi. 18. It was also called, as here, *Aram Nabaraim*, *Gen.* xxiv. 10, *Deut.* xxiii. 4. i. e. *Mesopotamia* or *Syria* between the Rivers, viz. *Euphrates* and *Tigris*. *Chusan-Rishathaim*, that is, the wicked *Cushite*, as the *Chaldee Paraphrase*, the *Syriac* and *Arabic Versions* render the Name, was probably a Descendant of *Cush* by *Nimrod*, whose Posterity inhabited this Part of *Syria*. Whence we may infer that this King was not an *Assyrian*, or Descendant of *Asbur*, from whom the *Assyrians* were called, and the Scriptures never confound the *Assyrians* with the *Syrians*: though the ancient Pagan Writers often do.

Antilibanus;

Antilibanus; and *Aram Zoba* in *Cæle-Syria*. These Countries had their own Kings, and were independent on the Kings of *Assyria* who ruled in *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa* by their Præfects. The *Greek* and *Latin* Writers frequently confound the *Syrians* with the (91) *Assyrians*; and the *Assyrian* Kings being called Kings of the *Syrians*;

(91) Οὗτοι δὲ [*Herodotus* speaking of the *Assyrians*] ὑπὸ μὲν Ἑλλήων ἐκαλέοντο Σύρας, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν Βαβυλωνίων Ασσύρας ἐκλήθησαν. lib. vii. p. 407. and *Herodotus* himself calls the *Syrians* by the Name of *Assyrians*. Speaking of the *Phœnicians*, he saies; they in ancient Times carried *Egyptian* and *Assyrian* Merchandises into other Countries, and also unto *Argos*, lib. i. p. 1. Here by *Assyrian* he meant *Syrian*, *Phœnicia* being a Part of *Syria*, and the Goods which the *Phœnicians* carried into other Countries, were chiefly from *Syria* and *Egypt*, and the Merchandises of *Tyre* and *Sidon*, nor had they any Thing to do with the *Assyrians*. *Strabo* saies that *Semiramis* and *Ninus* were called *Syrians*; and he calls *Nineveh* the Metropolis of *Syria*: τὴ δὲ Σεμιράμιδος καὶ τοῦ Νίνου Σύρον λεγομένην — Νῦν γὰρ ὡς ἀντιμετέπολις τῆς Συρίας, Geog. lib. ii. p. 138, 139. And *Diodorus Siculus* saies that *Ninus* built *Nineveh* in *Syria*, i. e. *Assyria*, lib. ii. p. 115. *Strabo* again calls the *Assyrians* *Syrians*, lib. xvi. init. *Æschylus* in his *Persæ*, calls an *Assyrian* or *Persian* Chariot, Σύρον ἄρμα, a *Syrian* Chariot. *Cicero* likewise calls *Sardanapalus* King of *Syria*, for *Assyria*, ex quo *Sardanapali* opulentissimi *Syriæ* (i. e. *Assyriæ*) regis error agnoscitur. *Tusc. Quæst.* And *Julian* saies, Imperium *Assyrii*, qui postea *Syri* dicti sunt, mille trecentis annis tenuere. lib. i. c. 2. Again the *Syrians* were called *Assyrians*, *Assyrii* (i. e. *Syri*) solem sub nomine *Jovis*, quem *Dia Heliopoliten* cognominant, maximis cæremoniis celebrant in civitate quæ *Heliopolis* nuncupatur. *Macrobius*. *Saturnal.* lib. i. c. 23. *Heliopolis* is known to have been a City of *Syria*, and *Orpheus* in his *Argonautic* Poem calls the *Uri* and *Solyimi* and other *Syrian* Nations, Ασσυρίων τέλεια, i. e. genuine *Assyrians*, * 751, 752. *Homer*, as *Strabo* tells us, made no Mention of the *Syrians* (he means *Assyrians*) Geog. lib. xv. p. 1068. But *Homer* mentioned the *Syrians* and called them *Arini* Ἀρίνοι, Il. ii. * 783. and *Pindar* called them by the same Name. And *Strabo* observes that they meant *Syrians* called *Arameans* or *Arammeans*, as *Strabo* elsewhere calls them. His Words are observable, εἶδε (*Homer* and *Pindar*) τὰς Σύρας Ἀρίμους δέχονται ἕως νῦν Ἀράμους (or Ἀραμμαίους as he afterwards calls them) λέγασσι, lib. xiii. p. 930. Again; τὰς γὰρ ὑπὸ ἡμῶν Σύρας καλεσμένους ὑπὸ αὐτῶν τῶν Συρίων — Ἀραμμαίους καλεῖσθαι, lib. i. p. 71. And again; λέγει δὲ καὶ τὰς Ἀρίμους ὁ ποιητής [*Ὁμηρος*] ὥς φησιν ὁ Ποσειδάωνι δέχεσθαι δεῖν μὴ τόπον τινα τῆς Συρίας — ἀλλὰ τῆς Συρίαν αὐτήν. Ἀραμμαῖσι γὰρ ἐστὶ αὕτη, lib. xvi. p. 1131. *Eustathius* by Mistake read *Tυρίαν* for *Συρίαν*, Comment. in *Homer*. Il. B. p. 262. edit. Basil. And *Arameans* or *Arammeans* was the true original Name of the *Syrians*, so called from *Aram* the Son of *Sem*, whose Posterity first inhabited the Countries called by the *Greeks* *Syria*. *Hesiod* also calls them by the
have

have made it thought that the *Assyrians* always reigned in *Syria*; and that the *Assyrian* Empire was extended from the River *Tigris* to the Western or *Mediterranean* Sea. This was the Error of *Ctesias*, and those who followed him; but the Scriptures always distinguish them. The *Syrians* are the People anciently called *Aramæans*; and *Arimi* by *Homer*, *Hesiod*, and *Pindar*: and they were so called from *Aram* the Son of *Sem*, whose Name and Country extended from *Phœnicia* to the River *Tigris*, and comprehended *Mejopotamia*, and reached to *Babylonia*. But *Assyria* was so called from *Asbur*, and contained only Countries beyond the *Tigris*, and was only a small Part of the upper or greater *Asia*.

WE find Mention of a *Syrian* Kingdom at *Zobab*, in the third Year of the Reign of *Saul*, in the Year before *Christ* 1075. It is said 1 *Sam.* xiv. 47. that *Saul took the Kingdom over Israel* (or was confirmed in his Kingdom) *and fought against all his Enemies on every Side: against Moab, and against the Children of Ammon, and against Edom, and against the Kings of Zobab* [or King as the Greek, or Kingdom as the Syriac Version has it] *and against the Philistines*.

This Kingdom of *Zobab* was that of *Hamath-Zobab* in *Cœle-Syria*, the Capital City of which was *Zobab*: and *Rehob* the Father of *Adad-exer* might now be King, 2 *Sam.* viii. 3. *Josephus* calls it by Mistake, (92) *Sophene*, which was in the greater *Armenia*, as (93) *Pliny* and *Strabo* tell us. *Zobab* lay North and East of *Damascus*, above Mount

same Name with *Homer* and *Pindar* *Theogon.* v. 304. *Josephus* observes that the *Aramæans*, the Descendants of *Aram*, were those whom the Greeks called *Syrians*. *Ἀραμαῖος δὲ Ἀραμὸς ἐστίν, ὃς Ἑλλήνων Σύρος προσαγορεύεται*, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. i. c. 6. But though the Greeks called the *Assyrians* by the Name of *Syrians*, yet they distinguished the *Syrians* properly so called, or the *Aramæans* from the *Assyrians*; and *Strabo* describes the utmost Extent of *Syria* to be from *Babylon* Westward to the *Sinus Issicus* in *Cilicia*, and Northward thence to the *Euxine* Sea, *Lib.* xvi. init. and *Hesychius* calls *Syria* the Country which reaches from *Phœnicia* to *Babylon*, in voc. See *Pomponius Mela* lib. i. c. 11. *Plin. Hist. Nat.* lib. v. c. 12. *Just.* lib. i. c. 2. and *Walton's Prolegom.* ad *Bib. Polyglot.* p. 87. Col. 1. and *Selden de Diis Syr.* *Prolegom.* xiii. p. 2, 3, 4.

(92) *Antiq. Jud.* lib. vii. c. 5.

(93) *Hist. Nat.* lib. v. c. 12. lib. vi. c. 9. *Strab. Geog.* lib. xi. p. 792, 793. *Libanus*,

Libanus, and had *Euphrates* on the East. It contained the Country of *Palmyrene* or *Tadmor*, 2 *Chron.* viii. 3, 4. and probably a Part of *Arabia Deserta*, and reached to the River *Euphrates*. *Josephus* (94) saies that *Palmyra*, as the *Greeks* call it, or *Tadmor*, as the *Syrians* call it, which was built by King *Solomon*, 2 *Chron.* viii. 4. was two Days Journey distant from the upper *Syria*; and was built in the Desert which was above *Cæle-Syria* or the *Damascene Syria*: and it is said to have been built in *Hamath-Zobab*, 2 *Chron.* viii. 3, 4. after *Solomon* had conquered it. Others think (95) *Zobab* was in the Province of *Hamath*, the upper or *Antiochian Syria*, and was *Aleppo* or *Berræa*. Dr. *Shaw* and *Sansón* (96) think *Hamath* was *Apamia*, and was ten Leagues Eastward of the Island *Aradus*, the *Arpad* of Scripture.

But *Josephus* and *Jerome* agree that (97) *Hamath* was *Epiphania*, near the Northern Boundary of the Holy Land, and was distinct from the other called great *Hamath* (*Amos* vi. 2.) which is the *Greek* (98) *Antioch*. And *Bochart* (99) saies that *Zobab* was near to *Damascus*. Though *Zobab* was not very near to *Damascus*, yet it appears from 2 *Chron.* viii. 3, 4. that *Hamath-Zobab* was in *Cæle-Syria*; and that *Zobab* was not far from *Tadmor*, and therefore must be *Epiphania*, or thereabout.

The Kingdom of *Zobab* had *Syria* of *Mesopotamia*, and the *Damascene Syria* confederate with it in the Reign of *David*. For after *David* had in the eighth or ninth Year of his Reign conquered

(94) *Antiq. Jud. lib. viii. c. 6.*

(95) *Hyde's Not. ad Peritfol. itiner. Mundi, p. 60, 61. Cellar. Geog. Antiq. Tom. ii. p. 362.*

(96) *Shaw's Travels. p. 325.*

(97) Ἀμαθὺ Ἀμαθίῳ καὶ ὄκησεν. ἥτις ἐστὶ καὶ νῦν ὑπὸ μὲν τῷ Πρωτοκλήτῳ Ἀμάθῃ καλεῖται. Μακεδόνες δὲ αὐτὴν Ἐπιφανίαν ἐπωνόμασαν, *Ant. Jud. lib. i. c. 6.* *Emath magna* nunc *Antiochia* nominatur: propheta autem *magnam* vocat ad distinctionem *minoris* *Emath*, quæ appellatur *Epiphania*. *Comm. in Amos c. vi.* See his *Quæst. Hebraic. in Gen. p. 516.* the upper or *Antiochian* or Great *Syria* is called *Hamath*, 1 *Chron. xviii. 9.* where *Tou* or *Toi* was King at the same Time that *Hadad-Ezer* was King of the other or lesser *Hamath*, called *Hamath-Zobab* y³.

(98) *Bochart. Geog. Sac. p. 307.*

(99) *De Sed. Aulæ Ægypt. ad fin. Geog. Sac. p. 1109.*

the *Jebusites*, and taken the Fort (1) of Mount *Zion* from them, 2 Sam. v. 6—9. about the Year before *Christ* 1047 he waged War with *Hadad-Ezer* King of *Zobab*, and subdued him and the (2) *Syrians* of *Damascus* who assisted him, at the River *Euphrates*. *David* took from the *Servants* (who were the chief Captains) of *Hadad-Ezer* the Shields of Gold which they wore; and carried away a great

(1) *David* built round about it, and called it thenceforth the City of *David*. He also built a Palace in the City, in which he was assisted with Wood and Work by *Hiram* King of *Tyre*, 2 Sam. v. & 6—11. Soon after he had conquered the *Jebusites*, probably the same Year, he beat the *Philistines* in two several Battles, & 17—25. and about three Years after, in the eleventh or twelfth Year of his Reign, he conquered *Hadad-Ezer*, whom *Josephus* calls *Adrazar*, Antiq. Jud. lib. vii. c. 5. and lib. viii. c. 7.

(2) It does not appear from the Scripture History that the *Syrians* of *Damascus* had a King over them at this Time: but *Josephus* tells us, that *Hadad* was now King of *Damascene Syria*, and helped *Hadad-Ezer*, whom he calls *Adrazar*, in the War with *David*, Antiq. Jud. lib. vii. c. 5. And the Historian *Nicolaus* of *Damascus* saies (ibid.) that from this *Hadad*, the Kings of *Syria* afterwards retained the Name with the Kingdom, like the *Pharaohs* and *Ptolemys* in *Egypt*. Our learned Sir *John Marsham* thinks that *Hadad-Ezer* was King both of *Zobab* and *Damascene Syria*, Chron. p. 345, 346. and *Nicolaus* of *Damascus* saies the same, but calls him only *Adad*. *Hadad* seems to have been the Name of the great *Phœnician* God *Adad* or *Adod*, who is mentioned by *Sanchoniatho*, and thence derived to the Kings of *Syria*. We find this Name first amongst the Kings of *Edom*, Gen. xxxvi. 35, 39. where is mention of *Hadad* and *Hadar*. Now *Adar* or *Adir* signifies the magnificent or mighty Potentate: *Ezer* signifies Helper; or, if it was *Azar*, it signifies the God *Mars*, and was added to the Name *Adar*, to denote his martial Magnanimity and Prowess. The Greek Version reads the Word *Adraazar*, and *Josephus* *Adrazar*: and so the *Syriac* and *Arabic* Versions have it. And if this be the true Reading, it is derived from *Adar* and *Azar*, and signifies the most powerful Warrior: and he is called *Adar-Ezer* 2 Sam. x. 16. But as *Nicolaus* of *Damascus* read *Adad*, with whom the *Hebrew* and *Chaldee* agree; and as *Josephus* also calls the King of *Damascene Syria* *Hadad*; and his Posterity the Kings of *Syria* were so called; and the Difference might easily proceed from the Similitude of the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* Letters *Daleth* [ד] and *Resh* [ר], which are very much alike in both the Alphabets: the Name was probably derived from the old *Phœnician* God *Adod* or *Adad*; under which Name the *Syrians* at *Heliopolis* worshiped the Sun. See *Macrobius* Saturnal. lib. i. c. 23. *Seld.* de Dis Syr. p. 176, &c. and *Bochart*. Geog. Sac. lib. ii. p. 731.

Quantity of *Brass* from several Cities which he plundered and left. He also took the principal Cities of *Damascene Syria*, with *Damascus* the Capital itself, and put Garisons in them, and made the Kingdom tributary, 2 *Sam.* viii. 3—8. 1 *Chron.* xviii. 3—8.

About the same Time, or in the Year before *Christ* 1046, *David* subdued the *Moabites*, (3) *Edomites*, *Ammonites*, *Philistines*, and *Amalekites*, 2 *Sam.* viii. 1, 12, 14. 1 *Chron.* xviii. 1, 2, 11, 13. And by these Conquests was fulfilled the Prediction made to *Rebecca*, that of the two Nations which were in her Womb, *the Elder should serve the Younger*, *Gen.* xxv. 23. The *Edomites* the Posterity of *Esau* being entirely subdued by *David*, who put Garisons in all *Edom*, which became subject to him, 2 *Sam.* viii. 14. The same Prophecy was repeated by *Isaac*, *Gen.* xxvii. 29, 37, 40. By these Conquests also the Promises of God to *Abraham* and his Posterity were fulfilled, *Gen.* xv. 18. *Deut.* xi. 24. *Jos.* i. 4. and also the Prophecy of *Balaam*, *Num.* xxiv. 17, 18.

At this Time *Toi* was King of Great *Hamath* or the *Antiochian Syria*; and sent his Son *Joram* to congratulate *David* upon his Victory over *Hadad-Ezer*, with whom also he had been at War, 2 *Sam.* viii. 9, 10. 1 *Chron.* xviii. 9, 10.

Seven Years after this, in the Year before *Christ* 1039, *David* made War upon *Hanun* King of the *Ammonites*, for having shamefully

(3) In 2 *Sam.* viii. 13. it is said, *that David gat him a Name, when he returned from smiting the Syrians, &c.* It should be read *Edomites*, and not *Syrians*, his Conquests of the latter being mentioned a little before. And it is so read 1 *Chron.* xviii. 12. 1 *Kings* xi. 14, 15. and the *Septuagint Greek* Version, and the *Syriac* and *Arabic* Versions, and *Josephus* (*Antiq. Jud.* lib. vii. c. 6.) all read so in this Place. And this Reading is confirmed by the Verse following, *And he put Garrisons in Edom, throughout all Edom put he Garrisons, and all they of Edom became David's Servants*, &c. 14. The Mistake arose from the *Hebrew* Copier writing אֲרָם *Aram*, i. e. *Syria*, instead of אֶדֹם *Edom*. The same Error is committed in the 12th Verse, where instead of *Aram* it should be again *Edom*, as the *Greek*, *Syriac*, and *Arabic* Versions have it. On the other hand, in 1 *Kings* xi. 25. the *Greek*, *Syr.* and *Arab.* have *Edom* for *Aram*, which latter is the true Reading. These Mistakes, as observed before, arose from the Similitude of the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* Letters *Resh* and *Dalet*.

abused

abused his Embassadors; and beat the *Ammonites*, and the *Syrians* of *Zoba*, with those of other *Syrian* Princes who assisted *Hanun*, 2 *Sam.* x. 6—15. And immediately after in the same Year, he gave another total Defeat to *Hadarezer*, and his Army of *Mesopotamian Syrians* at (4) *Helam*, and slew *Shobach* the General of *Adar-Ezer's* Army, with forty Thousand (5) Footmen and Seven thousand Men who fought in Chariots, 1 *Chron.* xix. 18. 2 *Sam.* x. 18.

On the Occasion of this Deliverance from the great Power of the *Syrians*, and his entire Victory over them, *David* composed the 1xth Psalm, as the Inscription of it shews: and by this Victory he subdued the *Syrians* of *Zoba*, and all the *Syrian* Kings who were the Subjects or Allies of the King of *Zoba*: they all made Peace with *David*, and became tributary to him, 2 *Sam.* x. 19. 1 *Chron.* xix. 19. And thus

(4) *Josephus* saies that *Chalamas* or *Chalam* was King of the *Mesopotamian Syrians*, Ant. Jud. lib. vii. c. 6. But he has made a proper Name of a Place into that of a King; for *Chelam* or *Cbalam* was the Place beyond *Jordan*, probably not far from *Euphrates*, where the *Syrians* and *Israelites* met and fought, 2 *Sam.* x. 16, 17. which *Josephus* has taken no notice of. The *Syriac* and *Arabic* Versions, both in this Place, and in 1 *Chron.* xix. 16. by a gross Mistake, have *Edomites* for *Syrians*, which was owing to the reading of עֲדֹמִים *Edom* for אֲרָמִים *Aram*, as before observed. And *Josephus* in 2 *Sam.* x. 6. makes *Soba* a King instead of a Country, the *Syrians* of *Soba* or *Zoba*: he also makes *Istob* another King, which is two Words *Is-tob*, and means, *the Men of Tob*, a People bordering on the *Ammonites*, and upon the Confines of *Galaad*, Cellar. Geog. tom. ii. p. 541. See *Le Clerc* upon the Place. It is further observable, that *Hadar-Ezer*, or *Adar-Ezer* is here the Reading of all the Copies; and he seems to be the same King called before *Hadad-Ezer*.

(5) This Defeat of the *Syrians* is differently related in 2 *Sam.* x. v 18. where it is said, *the Syrians fled before Israel, and David slew [the Men of] seven hundred Chariots of the Syrians, and forty thousand Horsemen*. But *Josephus* agrees with the Account in the Book of *Chronicles*, and read it forty thousand Footmen, and seven thousand Horsemen. *Josephus* read *Rakab*, Horsemen, instead of the *Masorete Hebrew* Reading *Rekeb*, Chariots: and *Rakab* is undoubtedly the true *Hebrew* Reading; tho' the *Septuagint* also read *Rekeb*, Chariots. But it is more proper to say that he slew seven thousand Horsemen, than that he slew seven thousand Chariots; in which latter Expression we must understand the Meaning to be, *the Men* of seven thousand Chariots, or who fought in them.

an End was put to the powerful Syrian Kingdom of *Zobab*, and we hear no more of it.

The next Year, in the Spring, which was in the Year before *Christ* 1038, *Joab*, by *David's* Order, led forth the Army of the *Israelites* against the *Ammonites*; and having wasted their Country, he laid close Siege to *Rabbab* the Royal City. Having invested the City, and prevented any Provision from being carried into it; and also intercepted the (6) Well or Spring which supplied the City with Water, and cut off all Communication of the Inhabitants with it, they were hereby soon reduced to the utmost Extremity; so that *David* came and easily took it by Storm. When he had taken it, he gave the Soldiers leave to plunder the City, but reserved the richest and most valuable spoils to himself: and then wreck'd his Vengeance on the People both of this and all the other Cities of the *Ammonites*. He put them to Death with the most (7) cruel Torments. For some were

(6) *Joseph. Antiq. Jud. lib. vii. c. 7.*

(7) Τὴς ἀνδρῶν αἰσχρομήτορας διέφθειρε, *Joseph. ibid.* This cruel Treatment of the conquered *Ammonites* is the most barbarous Act of *David's* Reign that we read of; and cannot be justified, tho' he had received a very high Affront in the Abuse of his Embassadors. But as one Sin draws on another, he had just before been guilty both of Adultery and Murder with regard to *Uriah* and his Wife. And the Spirit of God having now forsaken him, he was become furious and cruel, as well as lustful. For this Fact happened before *Nathan* was sent to him. Here it may be proper to consider a Difficulty about the Age of *Solomon* when he began to reign. He has generally been thought by the Ancients not to have been more than twelve or thirteen Years old at the Death of *David*. But this is a groundless Supposition, and inconsistent with the Scripture History. *Reboboam* the Son of *Solomon* was in the forty first Year of his Age when he began to reign, 1 *Kings* xiv. 21. 2 *Chron.* xii. 13. So he was begot by *Naamah* the *Ammonite's* before the Death of *David*, or about that Time; and therefore *Solomon* had married *Naamah*, or used her as his Concubine, before he married *Pharaoh's* Daughter; this being after he came to the Crown, 1 *Kings* iii. 1. Hence it is probable that *Solomon* was nineteen or twenty Years of Age when he succeeded his Father *David*; and *David* at the Time of his Death calls him a wife Man, 1 *Kings* ii. 9. And this Age of *Solomon* may be infer'd from the History of Scripture before us. *David* took *Rabbab* in the Year before *Christ* 1038. *Bathsheba* was then with Child by *David*, and was brought to bed of a Son this Year, or the Beginning of the next. 2 *Sam.* xi. 27. This Child died soon after his Birth, ch. xii. 18.

Jerem

sawn asunder; others had their Flesh torn off by the *Iron Spikes of Harrows*; others were slain *with the Ax*; and others were made to *pass through the burning Brick-kilns*, 2 Sam. xi. 1. ch. xii. 29, 30, 31. 1 Chron. xx. 1, 2, 3.

It is said 2 Sam. xii. 30. 1 Chron. xx. 2. *that David took the King's Crown from off his Head, the Weight whereof was a Talent of Gold, and it had a precious Stone in it: and it was set on David's Head.* Our English Translation has *precious Stones*; but the Hebrew, Greek, Chaldee Targum, and Josephus, all have it in the Singular Number, *a precious Stone*; which Josephus (8) saies was a Sardonyx, and was set in the Middle of the Crown. And besides we must not think that the Crown of *Hanun* was the Weight of a Talent, as the Text seems to intimate; if it had, it would have been too heavy to wear, for it would have been about 125 Pound Weight; for so much the Hebrew Talent weighed, which was double to the Attic Talent. It is evident from Exodus xxxviii. 25, 26. that the Hebrew Talent was 3000 Shekels, or 12000 Attic Drams, which made two Attic Talents; for 603550 Men taxed at a Bekah or half Shekel, raised no more than an hundred Talents and 1775 Shekels, which is exactly 6000 Bekahs or 3000 Shekels to a Talent. Therefore the Meaning of the *Crown weighing a Talent of Gold*, is that

Soon after *Bathsheba* conceived and bare *Solomon*, & 24. so *Solomon* was born in the Year before *Christ* 1037, or the Beginning of 1036, and was nineteen or twenty Yeaas old when he began to reign after the Death of *David*, in the Year before *Christ* 1017. The learned Chronologer *Peta-vius* placeth the Birth of *Solomon* in the Year before *Christ* 1038, and makes him 23 Years of Age at the Death of *David*, Doct. temp. lib. xiii. p. 536. It is shewn that *Rehoboam* might be 40 or 41 Years old when he began to reign, as all the Copies and Josephus agree; and the Addition to the *Vatican* and *Aldine* Copies in 3 Kings xii. 24. which makes him no more than 16 Years of Age at this Time is of no Authority, and contradicts both these Copies, which in two several Places make him 41 Years old when he began to reign. See the *Roman* Edition in 3 Reg. xiv. 1. 2 Chron. xii. 13. and the *Aldine* Edition 3 Reg. xiv. and 2 Chron. v. He is indeed said by his Son *Abia* to have been *young, Nabar*, and νεώτερος, when he came to his Throne, 2 Chron. xiii. 7. But then *Joshua* is also called νεός, *Nabar*, i. e. a young Man *Exod.* iii. 11. tho' he was then *forty three* Years old; being 110 Years old when he died (*Josh.* xxiv. 29) 67 Years after the *Exodus*.

(8) Antiq. Jud. lib. vii. c. 7.

it was equal in Value to a Talent of Gold. A Talent of Gold, was only so much Gold as was equal in Value to a Talent of Silver; just as amongst us a Thousand Pounds Sterling in Gold, is only the Value of a Thousand Pounds Sterling in Silver. The Ancients had no Talent Weight of Gold, but only of (9) Silver. *Hanun's* Crown then weighed Twelve Pounds and an half; and Gold being reckoned Ten times more in Value than Silver amongst the Ancients, it was equal in Value nearly to 375 Pounds Sterling, which was the *Jewish* Talent. *David* having finished all his Wars and Conquests, was the Instrument of fulfilling the Promise which God made to *Abraham*, that he would give to his Seed or Posterity, the Land or Country which extended from the River of Egypt, unto the great River, the River Euphrates, *Gen. xv. 18.* The Extent of this Kingdom is described in the Beginning of *Solomon's* Reign, *1 Kings iv.* and it is said, *ŷ 21. And Solomon reigned over all Kingdoms from the River (Euphrates) unto the Land of the Philistines, and unto the Border of Egypt: they brought Presents and served Solomon all the Days of his Life.*

The Wars of *David* ended about the Year before Christ 1037, so that in the space of about 38 Years; the *Jews* under *Saul* and *David* their two first Kings, had conquered all the Nations of *Cæle-Syria*, with *Damascene Syria*, and *Palmyrene*, *Ituræa*, *Batanæa*, the *Moa-bites*, *Ammonites*, *Edomites*, *Philistines*, and all the Countries from *Tiphsab* (or *Tbapsacus*) situated upon the *Euphrates*, to *Gaza* westward, and the Borders of *Egypt*, *1 Kings iv. 24.*

(9) That the Talent and other Standards of Money amongst the Ancients were of Silver only, appears evident from *Xenophon*. *Armenius* computed his Riches altogether by the Silver Talent, *Xen. Institut. Cyr. lib. iii. p. 68.* And *Titbraustes* the *Persian* General sent *Timocrates* the *Rhodian* with a Sum of Gold to bribe the *Græcian* Cities to break with the *Lacedæmonians*; which Sum of Gold he does not express by a Number of Gold Talents; but saies that he gave him Gold equal in Value to fifty Talents of Silver, *Hist. Gr. lib. iii. p. 502.* This shews that a Gold Talent equal to ten Silver Talents was not known: if there had been any such Talent, *Xenophon* would have said, that he gave him Five Talents of Gold. His Words are: *Χρήμα'α δ' ἔφη (ὁ Ἀρμένιος) συν τοῖς θησαυροῖς, οἷς ὁ παῖς κατέλιπε. ἔστιν, εἰς ὀγδύεον λογισθέντα, τάλαντα πλείω τ' τετραχίλιον.* And he saies of *Titbraustes*: *πέμψεν Τιμοκράτην τὸν Ῥόδιον εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα, δὲς χρυσίον εἰς πενήκοντα τάλαντα ὀγδύεον.*

Hence it is evident, that the *Assyrians* had not yet made any Conquests either in *Mesopotamia* or on this Side the *Euphrates*; and that although they had conquered all the upper *Asia*, and were possessed of *Babylon* and *Chaldæa*, yet they kept no Armies in these Countries, or made any Expeditions beyond the Limits of them. Had *Mesopotamia* or *Syria* been subject to the *Assyrians*, we must have heard of their assisting those and the other neighbouring Nations in their Wars with the *Jews*: and they would probably soon have stopped the Progress of the *Israelitish* Arms, and kept them at a Distance from their Provinces, and confined them to the Land of *Canaan* and *Judæa*. But as in all the Wars of *David* with Nations bordering on the River *Euphrates*, and not far distant from *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa*, we never hear so much as the Name of any of the Kings of *Nineveh* or *Assyria*; we may be sure that they had no Forces in these Countries, which were able to oppose the Arms of the *Jews*, and that their Empire was at that Time confined in the lower *Asia* to the Nations beyond *Euphrates*.

After the *Syrian* Kingdom of *Zobab* had been subdued by *David*, and made tributary to the *Jews*, it decayed, and never recovered its Greatness and Power any more. But in the latter end of *David's* Reign, the *Syrians* of *Damascus* revolted, and set up a Kingdom under *Rezon* the Son of *Eliadab*, who was a Subject of *Hadad-Ezer* King of *Zobab*, and had rebelled and fled from him; and gathered together an Army of dissolute and seditious (10) Fellows, and became

(10) In the Text, 1 *Kings* xi. 24. the Men who followed *Rezon* are called a *Band*: but *Josephus* understood it to be a *Band of Robbers*, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. viii. c. 7. p. 442. And the Latin Vulgate and *Jerome* render the *Hebrew* Word *Gedud*, translated *Band*, by *latronum*, i. e. Robbers: and this seems to be the true Sense of the Word in this Place. The *Septuagint Greek* Version renders it συσρέμματος, which is a military Term, signifying a Band of a certain Number of Soldiers. It is used by *Polybius*, lib. i. concerning the *Carthaginians*. *Budeus* observes that the Verb συσρέφειν (whence σύσρεμμα is derived) is the same as τὸ συνιστάναι, ἀντὶ τῆς σασιασικῆς συναγωγῆς, catervam factiosam cogere, *Comment. Ling. Gr.* p. 673. Agreeably to this *Hesychius* interprets the Word συσρεμμάτων by θορύβων, πλάνων. Whence *Suidas* renders συσρέμματα, σασιασῶν πλήθη. The Number of a σύσρεμμα or Band of Soldiers was a Thousand or Two χίλια, as *Budeus* their

their Captain, with whom he went to *Damascus*, and reigned there over the *Damascene Syria*, 1 *Kings* xi. 23, 24, 15. This was the Beginning of the Kingdom of *Damascene Syria*.

The learned Archbishop *Usher* placeth the founding of the *Damascene* Kingdom of *Syria* by *Rezon*, in the Year before Christ 1044, when *David* beat the Army of *Hadad-Ezer* King of *Zobab* at *Euphrates*, and took from him a *Thousand Chariots and Seven thousand Horsemen and Twenty thousand Footmen*; and at the same Time slew of the *Syrians of Damascus* who came to help *Adad-Ezer*, *Two and twenty thousand*, 1 *Chron.* xviii. 3, 4, 5. compare 2 *Sam.* viii. 3, 4, 5. These *Damascene Syrians* *Usher* thinks (11) were commanded by *Rezon*, and that he fled with the Remainder of them to *Damascus*, and there settled a Kingdom for himself and Posterity over them. But this Account by no means agrees with the Scripture-History, which saies, that *David* (having gained a complete Victory over the *Syrians* both of *Zobab* and *Damascus*) put *Garisons in Syria of Damascus*, to secure his Conquest of it; and the *Damascene Syrians* became *David's Servants, and paid Tribute to him*, 2 *Sam.* viii. 6. 1 *Chron.* xviii. 6. So that it is not probable that *Rezon*, if he had commanded the Army of the *Damascene Syrians* at this Battle, could, after such a total Defeat, and the Loss of Twenty two thousand Men, have made himself Master of *Damascus*, and have reigned there over the *Syrians*. This is inconsistent with *David's* having *Garisons* in several Cities of the *Damascene Syria*, and these *Syrians* being tributary to him: Nor is there any Intimation of *Rezon* having any Power at *Damascus*, or commanding the *Damascene* Army in this War. And it is observable, that in the War, which happened Seven Years after between *David* and the *Ammonites*, who hired the *Syrians* of several Kingdoms all round to assist them, there is no mention of the *Damascene Syrians*, though they were nearer to them than the *Syrians of Zobab*, whom

thinks, p. 673. But it is said to be 2048 Men in a Piece at the End of the *Lexicon* of *Suidas* concerning the ancient Military Art. Σύστημα β ξεναγία αὐθῶν καὶ. p. 714. col. 2. so a ξεναγία was 1024 Men; and is so explained in the same Treatise; where it is added; οἱ δὲ πλεῖστοι τῶν πρὸ πλεῖθος χιλιαρχίας καλεῖται. So that *Budeus* seems to be mistaken.

(11) *Annal.* p. 53.

they

Syrians of Zobah, whom they hired. The Reason, no doubt, was because the *Damascene Syrians* were subject to *David*.

Archbishop *Usher's* Opinion is founded on what is related of *Rezon* 1 *Kings* xi. 23, 24, 25. where it is said, that in the latter Part of the Reign of *Solomon*, in the Year before *Christ* 980 by *Usher's* reckoning, when he was old and drawn into Idolatry by his *Wives* (1 *Kings* xi. 3, 4.) God stirred up against him an Adversary, *Rezon* the Son of *Eliadab*, who had fled from his Lord *Hadad-Ezer* King of *Zobah*; and he gathered Men unto him, and became Captain over a Band, when *David* slew them (of *Zobah*) and they went to *Damascus* and dwelt therein, and reigned in *Damascus*; and he was an Adversary to *Israel* all the Days of *Solomon*. Hence it appears that *Rezon* was not the Commander of the *Damascene Syrians*, who assisted *Hadad-Ezer* against *David*; but that he was a *Syrian* of *Zobah*, and a Servant or Officer of *Hadad-Ezer*; and afterwards rebelled against him; and having got together a Body of seditious Men, who made him their Captain, they fled from *Hadad-Ezer* to *Damascus*, and seized the City; and afterwards reigned there, either in the latter end of *David's* Reign, or the Beginning of the Reign of *Solomon*.

It is not said in the Text of 1 *Kings* xi. 24. though it is in our Translation, that *Rezon* fled from *Hadad-Ezer* at that Time when *David* slew them of *Zobah*; *Zobah* is not in the Text: and the Victory which *David* obtained over the *Syrians* of *Zobah*, 2 *Sam.* viii. 3, 4. was 64 Years before *Rezon* was stirred up to make war against *Solomon*, as here mentioned. And it being further said, that he was an Adversary to *Israel* all the Days of *Solomon*, & 25. the Supposition of *Usher* makes *Rezon* too old, and his Reign too long. For from the Year before *Christ* 1044. where *Usher* placeth the Defeat of *Hadad-Ezer* and the *Damascene Syrians*, unto the Year before *Christ* 975, when *Solomon* died by his reckoning, it is 69 Years; and so long *Rezon* must have reigned at *Damascus* at the Death of *Solomon*; and how much longer we know not. So that it is far more credible, if not certain, that the Kingdom of *Damascus* was not set up by *Rezon* till the latter End of the Reign of *David*, or till after his Wars with the *Philistine* Giants. 2 *Sam.* xxi. 15. 1 *Chron.* xx. 4, etc. And then it is probable that he defeated *Rezon's* Band of Robbers,

and having slain part of them, *Rezon*, with the rest, went to *Damascus*, where he lived till the Death of *David*, and then, or a little before his Death, persuaded the *Damascene Syrians* to revolt from the *Jews*, and to make him King.

Josepbus (12) thinks that the Kingdom of *Syria* was not recovered from the *Jews* till the Death of *David*; and he relates that *Hadad* the *Edomite*, whom he calls *Ader*, by the Assistance of *Rezon*, whom he calls *Razar*, and supposes to have then fled from his Master, whom he calls *Adrazar*, and to be at the Head of a Band of Robbers, made himself Master of Part of *Syria*, perhaps that of *Zobab*, and to have reigned there whilst *Rezon* reigned in *Damascene Syria*. And that *Hadad* ruled over *Syria* is not only the Interpretation of *Josepbus* of *25*. but also of the *Hebrew* Text and the *Vulgate Latin* Version, and the *Chaldee* Paraphrase: the *Greek*, *Syriac*, and *Arabic* Versions make *Hadad* to reign in *Edom*, reading in their *Hebrew* Copies *Edom* instead of *Aram*, from a Similitude of the *Hebrew* or *Samaritan* Letters *Daletb* and *Resh*, as I have observed above. But they all agree in understanding the latter Part of the 25th Verse, of *Hadad*, viz. that *he abhorred Israel*, etc. so that it is probable that *Hadad* and *Rezon* were confederate Kings of *Syria*, who invaded and oppressed the *Jews* in the latter Part of the Reign of *Solomon*.

The Kingdom of *Syria* under *Hadad* grew powerful in the latter Part of *Solomon's* Reign: and in the following weak Reigns of *Reboam* and his Son *Abijam*, who had continual Wars all their Days with *Jeroboam*, to whom ten of the Tribes of *Israel* revolted, this Kingdom was united to the *Damascene* Kingdom of *Syria*, and extended into *Mesopotamia*. For in the 26th Year of the Reign of *Asa*, 2 *Chron.* xvi. 1.

(12) *Antiq. Jud.* lib. viii. c. 7. p. 442.

(13) There is a Mistake in all the Copies about the Year of the Reign of *Asa* here mentioned. It is said to be the 36th Year of *Asa*, 2 *Chron.* xvi. 1. So the *Hebrew*, *Vulgate*: but the *Vatican* and *Aldine* have it 38th, and so the *Alexandrine*. But this could not be, because *Baasha* died in the 26th Year of *Asa*. He began to reign in the third Year of *Asa*, and reigned 24 Years; and died in the 26th of *Asa* ending. 1 *Kings* xv. 33. xvi. 8. Archbishop *Usher* would have it to be the 36th Year from the Revolt of the ten Tribes, and the 16th of the Reign of *Asa*. *Annal. Vet. Test.* p. 64. But

which

which was in the Year before Christ 932, when *Baasha King of Israel* went up against *Judah*, and was building (or fortifying) *Ramab*, (which he had taken from the King of *Judah*) that he might not suffer any to go out or come in to *Asa King of Judah*, 2 Chron. xvi. 1. 1 Kings xv. 17. *Asa*, with a great Sum of Money, hired *Ben-Hadad* (or the Son of *Hadad*) the Son of *Tabriman*, the Son of *Hexian*, who reigned at *Damascus*, to assist him against the King of *Israel*; which he accordingly did, and sent a great Army, and invaded and ravaged the Cities of *Israel*, and all the Land of *Naphtali*. This obliged *Baasha* to leave off fortifying *Ramab*, and to return to defend his own Country, 1 Kings xv. 17 — 22. 2 Chron. xvi. 1 — 6. where he soon after died. This *Ben-Hadad* many Years after besieged *Samaria* in the Reign of *Abab*, in the 18th Year of his Reign, and the Year before Christ 903. He had with him thirty two Kings his Allies, with their Armies which they brought out of *Mesopotamian Syria*, as *Josephus* tells us, 1 Kings xx. 1. But he was beaten, and obliged to raise the Siege, and flee, *Y* 20, 21. The next Year he came again with a prodigious Army against *Abab*, and received a total Overthrow near *Aphek*, where the *Israelites* slew an hundred thousand *Syrians* in one Day in the Field of Battle; the rest with *Ben-Hadad* fled to *Aphek*, and twenty seven thousand of them were killed by the Wall of the City falling on them, *Y* 29, 30. *Ben-Hadad* surrendered himself to *Abab*, who received him courteously, and made Peace with him for three Years on Condition of his restoring all the Cities which the Kings of *Syria* had taken from the Kings of *Israel*, and that he should have free Access to *Damascus*, whenever he pleased, *Y* 33, 34. ch. xxii. *Y* 1.

Ben-Hadad's reigning over *Syria* and *Damascus*, and the Territories belonging to it, and having confederate with him thirty two *Syrian* Kings of *Mesopotamia*, shews very plainly that the *Assyrian* Kingdom in lower *Asia* was not yet extended farther than *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa*; and that the *Assyrians* had made no Conquests in *Mesopotamia* or *Syria*. *Hazael* succeeded *Ben-Hadad*, 2 Kings viii. 15. and was, as

this Sense has no Propriety or Example in Scripture; and *Josephus* read it the 26th Year: for he saies, that, after *Baasha* returned from *Ramab*, he was prevented by Death from renewing the War against *Asa*. Antiq. Jud. lib. viii. c. 12. p. 456.

Elisba had foretold him, ✠ 12. a cruel Enemy to the *Israelites* all his Reign; seizing and burning their Cities, and destroying their Armies, which by continual Victories he reduced so low, that *Jeboabaz* the Son of *Jebu* could raise no more Forces to defend himself and his Country against the *Syrians*, than *fifty Horsemen, and ten Chariots; and ten thousand Footmen*, 2 *Kings* xiii. 7. After the Death of *Hazael*, who was succeeded by his Son *Ben-Hadad* in the Year before *Christ* 838, the Kingdom of *Syria* began to decline; and according to the Prophecy of *Elisba* a little before his Death, *Joash* Son of *Jeboabaz* King of *Israel* beat the *Syrians* in three several Battles at *Aphek*, and recovered from *Ben-Hadad* all the Cities which *Hazael* had taken from *Jeboabaz* his Father by War, 2 *Kings* xiii. 17, 25. After the Death of *Joash*, his Son, *Jeroboam* the second, carried on the War against the *Syrians*, and took *Damascus*, and recovered all the Cities of *Israel* from *Hamath* unto the Sea of the Plain, or the Lake of *Sodom*, according to the Prophecy of *Jonab*; and so restored all the Coast from North to South, which had belonged to *Judah* and *Israel*, and had been conquered by the *Syrians*, 2 *Kings* xiv. 25, 28. And the *Syrians* again became tributary to the *Israelites*.

About the Beginning of the Reign of *Jeroboam* the second, or in the Year before *Christ* 823. *Ctesias* placed the Revolt of the *Medes* and *Babylonians* which was completed by the taking of *Nineveh* in the third Year of the War, and in the Year before *Christ* 821. *Eusebius* placed this Revolt in the Year before *Christ* 818. *Petavius* placed it in the Year before *Christ* 876, which is 45 Years too high. And *Usher* placed it in the Year before *Christ* 748, which is 73 Years lower than *Ctesias* placed it. And so *Usher* makes *Belefsis*, who is supposed to have assisted *Arbaces* in the Revolt, to be *Nabonassar* the first *Babylonian* King in *Ptolemy's* astronomical Canon. *Eusebius* and *Petavius* computed in different Ways from an arbitrary Reckoning of the Beginning of the Reign of *Ninus*, and of the Duration of the *Assyrian* Empire. But *Usher* alledged the Authority of *Herodotus*, who said that the *Assyrians* had reigned over the upper or greater *Asia* 520 Years before the *Median* Revolt. But *Herodotus* does not say that *Ninus* began to reign only 520 Years before the Revolt of the *Medes*; but he saies the *Assyrians* had reigned so many Years over the upper
Asia.

Afa. His supposing *Ninus* to begin then to reign, is not at all supported by the Testimony of *Herodotus*, and is contrary to the Evidence of all ancient Writers, who agree that the *Assyrian* Empire had subsisted about 1300 Years before the *Median* Revolt; so that *Usher's* is a strange Hypothesis, and altogether unsupported, and is a Metachronism of no less than 748 Years, by his own reckoning of the Time of the *Median* Revolt.

The Mistake of *Ctesias* in placing the *Median* and *Babylonian* Revolt from the *Assyrian* Empire so high as *Arbaces* in the Year before *Christ* 821, has been fatal in Chronology; and greatly puzzled and misled both the most learned ancient and modern Chronologers: who not suspecting that *Ctesias* had erred more than an hundred Years (in Reality more than 200 Years) have been perplexed to reconcile the Scripture-History of the *Assyrian* Kings during the Interval of these Years with that supposed Revolt and Dissolution of the *Assyrian* Empire. In Order to this they have been forced to frame several Hypotheses, and to make the *Assyrian* Empire revive at *Nineveh*; and to continue for about 200 Years, but with less Power and Extent, though *Ctesias* related that *Nineveh* was destroyed and the *Assyrian* Empire dissolved and transferred to the *Medes* and *Babylonians*.

Eusebius, in his *Chronicon*, saies that *Arbaces* having destroyed the *Assyrian* Empire, transferred it to the *Medes*; and that in the Interval between *Arbaces* and *Dejoces*, which he makes 111 Years, the *Chaldeans* had their own Kings, and likewise other Nations (of the *Assyrian* Empire); but he knew none of them: and he owns, p. 116. that *Salmanasar* King of *Assyria* translated the ten Tribes, which he carried captive from *Samaria* into the Mountains of *Media*: and also that *Senacherib* sent a Colony of *Assyrians* into *Judæa*: also that *Tiglath-Pileser* King of *Assyria* transported a great Number of *Jews* into *Assyria*. All this is inconsistent with the supposed Dissolution of the *Assyrian* Empire. *Syncellus*, in his *Chronography*, p. 205. endeavours to solve the Difficulty by supposing that the *Assyrian* Empire was really and undoubtedly destroyed and subject to the *Medes*; but that the *Name* of it was still retained on Account of its ancient Grandeur: and that those called Kings of *Assyria* after *Arbaces*

Arbaces were subject to the *Medes*, and acted only as their Viceroy.

Scaliger (14), *Petavius*, and others of our learned modern Chronologers were led by *Ctesias* into a confused Notion, that the *Assyrians*, after their Subjection to the *Medes* under *Arbaces* and some of his Successors, freed themselves from that Subjection, and establish-

(14) *Scaliger* saies, *Salmanassarum* non *Babylonis*, sed *Ninevæ* regem fuisse : *Nabonassarum* vero fuisse regem *Babylonis*. *Emendat. Temp.* lib. v. p. 392. He adds, p. 393. Falso colligunt *Salmanasar* fuisse regem *Babyloniæ* ex posteriore *Regum* cap. xvii. (¶ 24.) ubi scribitur, regem *Assyriæ* ex *Babylonia* colonias in *Samariam* deduxisse. Nos vero dicimus, aliud esse ex *Babylonia* deducere colonias, aliud ex urbe *Babylone* : nam potuit partem quandam *Babyloniæ* obtinere *Salmanasar*, cum tamen non fuerit rex *Babyloniæ*. Again he saies, *Nabonassar* videtur primus jugum *Medorum*, qui in *Assyria* regnabant, excussisse. *Not. in Fragm.* p. 41. Just before, p. 40, he saies, *Medi* ab initio *Arbaces* ad initium *Cyaxaris*, quem *Ctesias* *Astibarem* nominat, res *Assyriorum* obtinuerunt 242 annis. This is not consistent with what he said in the preceding passage : and it was no more than 192 Years from the Beginning of *Arbaces* to the Beginning of *Cyaxares*. Presently after, p. 43, *Scaliger* is inclined to think that the *Medes* neither conquered the *Assyrian* Kingdom, nor destroyed *Nineveh*, as *Ctesias* related. Quum dicat (*Ctesias*) *Medos* a clade *Sardanapali* ad obitum *Astyagis*, *Assyriorum* regnum obtinuisse, merito ut dubitetur, facit sacra pagina, quæ *Tiglath-Phul-Asar* et *Senacherib* regum *Assyriæ* meminit. Sed neque verum est, *Ninum* a *Medis* solo æquatam, ut refert idem *Ctesias*, cum ei et divinarum literarum auctoritas, et *Herodotus* refragetur, qui in hac parte longe certior *Ctesia* a nobis deprehenditur. But how variable and perplexed *Scaliger* was in his Accounts, appears from his third Book of *Introductory Canons*, p. 322. Edit. 1658.

Petavius saies, Ego primum illud *Assyriorum* regnum in *Sardanapalo* funditus corruisse sentio, et ad *Medos* *Arbaces*que rerum pervenisse summam ; sed aliquanto post intervallo, exolecentibus paulatim *Medis* — nonnullos defecisse : primum quidem *Assyrios*, postea *Babylonios*. *Doct. Temp.* lib. ix. c. 35. And again, c. 52. he saies, Quamobrem uti post veteres illos *Assyrios* a *Medis* extinctos, eorum reliquæ, excusso *Medorum* jugo, *Nineveh* rursus novum instaurarunt imperium : Ita aliquanto post *Babylonii*, qui quidem vel *Medis* vel *Assyriis* hætenus paruerant, *Nabonassaro* duce libertatem et regnum sibi pepererunt — et quidem initio *Babylone* fere sola potitus videtur *Nabonassar*, cum regio ipsa vel ejus pars aliqua saltem ab *Assyriis* occuparetur. Hinc est quod *Salmanassar* lib. iv. *Regum* cap. xvii. ¶ 24. colonos e *Babylonia* in *Samariam* misisse dicitur. Nam *Babel* illic regionem ipsam significat. See also his *Rationar. Temp.* part. ii. lib. iii. c. 3. and part. i. lib. ii. c. 6.

ed a new Empire at *Nineveh*; and that some time after, the *Babylonians*, who were first subject to the *Assyrians*. and afterwards to the *Medes*, gained their Liberty, and set up a Kingdom under *Nabonassar* their Leader; all which is without Foundation, and inconsistent with Scripture and the Account of *Herodotus*: and *Scaliger* and *Petavius* are forced to own that *Nabonassar* ruled only over *Babylon* itself, whilst the Province of *Babylonia*, or at least a Part of it, was subject to the *Assyrians*; because it is said, 2 *Kings* xvii. 24. that *Salmanassar* King of *Assyria* sent a Colony from *Babylon* or *Babel* (which they understand to be *Babylonia*, though it is *Babylon* both in the *Hebrew Text* and in the *Greek*, and *Latin Vulgate*, and *Syriac Versions*, and also in the *Chaldee Paraphrase*) into *Samaria*.

Our learned *Usher* comes into the Story of *Arbaces* taking *Nineveh*, and restoring the *Medes* to their Liberty: but to make it more conformable to the Relation of *Herodotus*, he brings *Arbaces* down to the Time of the *Ptolemaic Canon*, and the Year before *Christ* 747; and by another Conjecture he supposes *Belesis*, who was Confederate with *Arbaces*, to be *Nabonassar* the first King of *Babylon*: and further supposes the *Assyrian* Empire still to have subsisted in a low Estate under *Ninus*, whom *Castor* related to be the Son of *Sardanapalus*, and whom the Archbishop thinks to be the *Tiglath-Pileser* of Scripture; and to account for *Salmanassar's* sending the *Israelites* from *Samaria* into the Cities of the *Medes*, he supposes that the *Assyrians* had taken from the *Medes* several of their (15) Cities. But all the Conjectures of this learned Prelate are altogether groundless, and not supported by the least Evidence.

Dr. *Prideaux* (16) in his Connection of the Old and New Testament makes *Arbaces* the same with *Tiglath-Pileser*, or *Tiglath-Pul-Ajar* (which is the right Name) and *Belesis* to be *Nabonassar* (or more truly *Nabonassar*) which is all mere Invention, and not founded in any Chronology: and it is also absurd, because *Arbaces* is a *Median* Name, and *Tiglath-Pul-Ajar* is an *Assyrian* Name; and so they could not be the same Person. But being sensible from Scripture-evidence

(15) *Annal. Vet. Test.* p. 86, 87, 88. 98, 99.

(16) *Part. I. b. i. p. 1, 2. 36.*

that *Media* was subject to the King of *Assyria*; and that there was no King in *Media* distinct from the King of *Assyria* to the End of the Reign of *Senacherib*; he supposes a second Defection of the *Medes* from the *Assyrians*, and that they revolted from *Senacherib* after the Loss of his Army in *Judæa* and his Return to *Nineveh*; and set up for themselves a sort of Democratical Government; but soon growing sick of the Confusions which this caused amongst them, they chose *Dejoces* for their King.

This, which Dr. *Prideaux* calls the second Defection, was in Truth the first, which happened upon the Death of *Senacherib*; and neither *Ctesias* nor any other ancient Historian ever mentioned a second Revolt of the *Medes*: and it is evident from *Herodotus*, that after the first Revolt of the *Medes* from the *Assyrians*, a few Years before they chose *Dejoces* for their King, they maintained their Liberty, and afterward their Kingdom, independent of the *Assyrians* to the last; to the final Destruction of the *Assyrian* Empire, and till they were conquered by *Cyrus*.

The Confusion, Inconsistency, and groundless Hypotheses of the fore-mentioned ancient and modern Chronologers were owing to their not being sensible that *Ctesias* had placed the Revolt of the *Medes* many Years too high, which he did in consequence of his placing the Epoch of the *Assyrian* Empire too high likewise. And having taken it for granted that there was a Revolt of the *Medes* and *Babylonians* under the Prefecture of *Arbaces*, they were forced to feign another Revolt in the End of the Reign of *Senacherib*, and to suppose, that, after the first Defection, the *Assyrians* had recovered all or most they had lost, both in *Babylonia* and *Media*; because it appears from the Scripture History, that nearly from the Time of the supposed Revolt by *Arbaces* and *Belefsis*, the *Assyrian* Empire subsisted in all its Greatness and Power, and its Dominion not only continued over *Babylonia* and *Media*, but was extended much farther than ever it had been before, by the Conquests of *Mesopotamia*, *Syria*, and the Kingdom of *Israel*, under their Kings *Pul*, *Tiglatb-Pul-Asar*, *Salmanasar*, and *Senacherib*, who, without Opposition or Controul, sent Colonies of Captives into *Assyria*, *Babylonia*, *Chaldæa*, and *Media*, and drew other Colonies out of these Countries, which they planted in the conquered Kingdoms.

This

This is sufficient to have made both the ancient and modern Chronologers suspect the Account of *Ctesias*, and, instead of acquiescing in it, to have put them on examining where the Error lay; especially since *Herodotus* had acquainted them that the first Revolt of the *Medes* was but a few Years before the Reign of *Dejoces*.

The History itself of *Ctesias* sufficiently confutes the Account of the Revolt of the *Medes* and Dissolution of the *Assyrian* Empire at the Time when *Arbaces* was Prefect of *Media*. For *Ctesias* supposes that the *Assyrian* Empire was then at the height, and extended over most Part of *Asia*; that *Mesopotamia*, and all *Syria*, *Egypt*, *Phœnicia*, and *Cœle-Syria*, and other Countries on this Side the River *Euphrates*,—were subject to it: whereas it is evident from the foregoing History of Scripture, that the *Assyrian* Empire at that time extended no farther westward in the *Lower Asia* than *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa*; and that the Kings of *Assyria* had made no Conquests in *Mesopotamia*, *Syria*, or *Phœnicia*; or had invaded any Part of *Judæa* or of the Kingdom of *Israel*: nor did the *Assyrians* make any Expedition into *Egypt* till about 140 Years after *Arbaces*, under *Esar-Haddon*.

Another thing which demonstrates that *Nineveh* was not overthrown and the *Assyrian* Empire dissolved by *Arbaces*, or at the Time fixed by *Ctesias*, is; that there are in Scripture several Prophecies concerning the Destruction of *Nineveh*, which were delivered after the Time when *Ctesias* related that it was taken and utterly demolished.

The Prophet *Jonah* was contemporary with *Arbaces*, and lived in the Reign of *Jeroboam* (17) the second, who reigned from the Year before *Christ* 823 to the Year before *Christ* 782. So that *Jonah*, about the Year before *Christ* 800, was sent by God to denounce his Judgment against the City and Inhabitants of *Nineveh* for their great Wickedness and Impieties, and to declare to them, that if they re-

(25) τέτω [Ἰεροβοάμω] προεφήτευσέ τις Ἰωνᾶς, ὡς δεῖ πολεμήσαντα τοῖς Σύροις αὐτὸν κεραιῆσαι τὸ ἐκείνων δυνάμεως καὶ πλατύναι τὴν αὐτῆς βασίλειαν, τοῖς μὲν καὶ ἡ ἄρχον μέρεσιν ἕως Ἀμάθω πόλεως, τοῖς δὲ καὶ ἡ μεσημβρίαν ἕως τῆς Ασφαλίδος λίμνης. .Antiq. Jud. lib. ix. c. 10. And *Jerome* saies, that the *Jews* related that *Jonah* prophesied at the same time with *Hoseah*, *Amos*, and *Isaiab*, Præfat. in Jon. tom. iii. p. 1471.

pented not, *Nineveh* should be immediately (18) *overthrown*. But both the King and People, upon the preaching of *Jonah*, humbled themselves, and turned from their evil Ways; and God, seeing the Sincerity of their Repentance, spared both the City and People, *Jonah* iii. 4, 10. And the Overthrow of *Nineveh* was by divine Providence deferred for about 200 Years. So that this Deliverance of *Nineveh* from the Overthrow threatened against it by the Prophet *Jonah* is a plain Demonstration that it was not then overthrown and the *Assyrian* Empire destroyed. The Destruction of *Nineveh* was afterward prophesied of, by (19) *Nabum*, in the Reign of *Jotham* King of *Judah*,

(18) The Words of *Jonah* in the *Hebrew* Text are, *he cried and said, Tet forty Days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown*, ch. iii. x' 4. All the *Greek* Copies have (τρεῖς ἡμέραι) *three Days*; and so the *Arabic* Version. And this Reading is favoured by *Josephus*, who saies, that *Jonah* proclaimed to the *Ninevites*, that their City and Kingdom should be destroyed (οὐκ ἔτι πολὺ χρόνος) *after a very little Time*: and that he left the City as soon as he had made this Proclamation, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. ix. c. 10. p. 498. So that *Josephus* had no Number of Days in his *Hebrew* Copy, and understood the Sense to be, in a very few Days; more agreeable to the Reading of the *Septuagint*, than to that of the present *Hebrew* Text. The Context also favours the *Septuagint* Reading; for *Jonah* staid in the City till the Time was come when he had proclaimed the Overthrow of it; and during this Time it is said, that both the King and People kept a Fast, and sat in *Sackcloth and Ashes*; and that, during the Fast, *neither Man nor Beast* were allowed to *taste any thing*; *neither to feed, nor drink Water*, x' 5, 6, 7. So that we cannot suppose that this Fast could continue more than two Days. And after *Jonah* was gone out of the City, angry and grieved that God had not destroyed it, he staid not above two Days out of it, to see what would become of it, ch. iv. x' 5, 6, 7, etc. So that either there was no Number of Days mentioned in the original *Hebrew* Text, but the *Septuagint* interpreted the Sense to be *three Days*, and the *Jews* afterward made them *forty Days*: or, if the Number of Days was expressed in the Text, it seems more probable that it was *three Days* than *forty Days*, for the Reasons assigned. The Reading of the *Septuagint* was in *Origen's* Copy: and he has it both in the Text and in his Commentary several Times, *Homil. i.* in *Jerem.* p. 53. and *Homil. xviii.* p. 182. But the *Hebrew* in his *Hexapla* had 40 Days. *Justin Martyr* cites it from the old *Greek* Vulgate of the *Septuagint*, *three Days*, as some Copies of his Dialogue with *Trypho* the *Jew* have it; though other Copies have 43 Days; which is evidently a corrupt Reading. *Edit. Thirlb.* p. 366, 367.

(19) *Jos. Antiq.* lib. ix. c. 11.

and.

and in the Reign of *Tiglatb-Pul-Afar* King of *Assyria*, about the Year before *Christ* 745, *Nab. i. ii. iii.* and many Years after this by *Sophoniah* in the Reign of *Josiah*, and about the Year before *Christ* 630, which was but a few Years before it was utterly destroyed and made desolate, *Sophon. ii. 13, 14, 15.* And although the *Medes* revolted in the last Year of *Senacherib*, or Beginning of the Reign of his Son *Afar-Haddon*, in the Year before *Christ* 710 or 711. yet the *Medes* only gained their own Liberty, which they ever after maintained. But the *Assyrian* Kings still reigned at *Nineveh*: and after *Afar-Haddon* we read that *Nabuchodonosor* reigned at *Nineveh* in the Days of *Arphaxad* or *Pbraortes* King of *Media*, *Judith i. 1.*

I shall add another Instance of the gross Mistake of *Ctesias*. He related (20) that when *Nineveh* was taken and destroyed by *Arbaces*, Prefect of *Media*, and *Belesis* the Priest Prefect of *Babylonia*, *Arbaces* possessed all the *Assyrian* Empire, except *Babylonia*, which he gave Tribute-free to *Belesis*, and made it an independent Kingdom: and that *Arbaces* carried all the Gold and Silver found in *Nineveh* unto *Ecbatana*; and divided the *Median* Empire into Satrapies and Provinces. All this plainly relates to the Destruction of *Nineveh*, and of the *Assyrian* Kingdom under the last King of it, by *Cyaxares* King of *Media*, assisted by *Nabo-Pul-Afar* Prefect of *Babylon*, who was the Father of *Nabuchadnezzar*, in the Year before *Christ* 606, as will be shewn more at large. For *Ecbatana* was now the capital City of *Media*; but it was built 130 Years or more after *Arbaces*, and in the Beginning of the Reign of *Dejoces*, as (21) *Herodotus* informs us, and about the Year before *Christ* 691. When *Cyaxares* and *Nabo-Pul-Afar* had taken and destroyed *Nineveh*, the *Assyrian* Kingdom in *Upper Asia* and beyond the *Euphrates* was transferred to the *Medes*; and *Babylon* and the Provinces on this Side the *Euphrates* became a distinct independent Kingdom under *Nabo-Pul-Afar* and his Posterity. And *Herodotus* (22) remarks that *Cyaxares* who conquered the *Assyrians*, was the first who divided his Kingdom into Provinces.

(20) Apud Diod. Sic. lib. ii. p. 141, 142.

(21) Lib. i. c. 98.

(22) Lib. i. c. 103.

So that it is abundantly evident that *Ctesias* mistook both the Time of the *Median* Revolt, and also the Time of the Destruction of the *Assyrian* Empire. His first Error was owing (as I have observed above) to his not having seen the *Chaldaean* Annals, and placing the Epoch or Beginning of the *Assyrian* Empire 111 Years too high; and so placing the *Median* Revolt so many Years too high likewise: for the Reigns of the *Assyrian* Kings from *Ninus* being deduced from their true Epoch reach to the true Time of the *Median* Revolt. His second Error in supposing that *Nineveh* was taken and destroyed, and the *Assyrian* Empire dissolved and transferred to the *Medes*, when they revolted from it, may also be accounted for. There were two Kings (22) of *Assyria*, each of whom the *Greeks* called *Sardanapalus*; the first of which was *Asar-Haddon*, who was a great *Warrior*, and reigned many Years, and lived to be old, as we are informed from *Athenæus* and *Suidas*; and was succeeded by a Son called *Ninus* by *Castor*: the second was *luxurious and effeminate*, and was burnt in his Palace. The Character of the first agrees to *Asar-Haddon*, who was a warlike King and a great Conqueror, and reigned 43 Years: and as the *Medes* revolted in the Beginning of his Reign; and other Provinces, as *Babylonia*, *Armenia*, and perhaps the *Upper Syria* followed their Example; these Defections greatly weakened the *Assyrian* Empire, and might be the Occasion of *Ctesias* relating that *Nineveh* was taken and destroyed and the *Assyrian* Empire transferred to the *Medes* in the Reign of this King, the first *Sardanapalus*, which happened above an hundred Years after, in the Reign of the second *Sardanapalus*, called *Sarac* by *Alexander Polyhistor*, who was such an effeminate King as *Ctesias* represented him. As there is so good Evidence that there were (23) two Kings of *Assyria* called *Sardanapalus*, in both whose Reigns the *Assyrian* Empire suffered by the *Medes* and *Babylonians*; in the Reign

(22) Σαρδαναπάλης ἐν β'. Περσικῶν δύο φησὶ γέγονέναι Καλλιθένης· ἓνα μὲν δραστήριον καὶ ἡμναῖον· ἄλλον δὲ μαλακόν. Suid. voc. ὁ δὲ Ἑλλάνικος ἐν τοῖς Περσικοῖς δύο φησὶ Σαρδαναπάλης γέγονέναι. Schol. in Aristophan. Aves, γ' 1022. p. 416. Edit. Kuster. Κλείταρχος δ' ἐν τῇ τελευτῇ τῆς περὶ Ἀλέξανδρον γήρας τελευτῆσαι φησὶν Σαρδανάπαλον μὲν τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν Σύρων ἀρχῆς. Apud Athenæi Deipnos. lib. xii. p. 530.

(24) γέγονεν δὲ δύο Σαρδανάπαλοι. Hesych. in voc. in agreement with the Historians cited in the foregoing Note.

of the first by a Defection, and in the Reign of the latter by a total Overthrow; it is, I think, probable, that *Ctesias* mistook the first for the latter *Sardanapalus*.

Having shewn how the ancient and most learned modern Chronologers have been misled by the Errors of *Ctesias*; and also what led *Ctesias* himself into those Errors, we may securely proceed to the Scripture History of the *Assyrian* Kings, as being connected with that of the *Jewish* Kings; and which contains not only the truest, but the most remarkable Transactions of those Kings for a series of about 164 Years, or to the Destruction of the *Assyrian* Empire.

The first *Assyrian* King whose Name is mentioned in Scripture was *Pul*, who might be the King who reigned at *Nineveh* when *Jonah* was sent to denounce God's Judgment against that City. He was the first King of *Assyria* who conquered the *Syrian* Kingdoms of *Mesopotamia*, viz. *Gozan*, *Haran*, *Rezepb*, and others, 2 *Kings* xix. 12. In the first Year of the Reign of *Menahem* King of *Israel*, and in the Year before *Christ* 770, *Pul* passed the *Tigris* and *Euphrates* with a great Army, and came through *Syria* into the Land of *Israel*, being invited, as is probable, by the People, to deliver them from the Tyranny of *Menahem*, who had usurped the Kingdom, and dealt cruelly with those who had opposed him, 2 *Kings* xv. 16. He is therefore the *Assyrian* mentioned by the Prophet *Hosea*, who upbraids the *Israelites* under the Name of *Ephraim* (25), for sending for Help to him against *Menahem*. *When Ephraim saw his Sickness — then went he to the Assyrian — yet could he not heal you*, ch. v. v. 13. He was so far from healing them, or delivering them from their Oppression; that *Menahem* finding himself not able to resist him, bought him off with a thousand Talents of Silver, which he gave him, that his Hand (or Power) might be with him, to confirm the Kingdom to him. This Sum he by Force exacted from the wealthiest of the People, by a Capitation of fifty Shekels of Silver for each Man; which the King of *Assyria* took, and departed out of the Land, leaving *Menahem* in Pos-

(25) The *Israelites*, or ten Tribes, are called *Ephraim* by the Prophet, because *Samaria*, the capital City of the Kingdom of *Israel*, was in the Tribe of *Ephraim*.

session of the Throne of *Israel*, 2 *Kings* xv. 19, 20. This shewed the *Affyrians* the Way into *Cæle-Syria* and *Judæa*. *Tiglatb-Pul-Afar*, called *Tiglatb-Pileser*, was probably the Son of *Pul*, and succeeded him in the *Affyrian* Empire. This King was sent for by *Abaz* King of *Judab*, to assist and deliver him from the Invasion of *Rezin* King of *Damascene Syria*, and *Pekab*, Son of *Remaliab*, King of *Israel*, who had formed a Confederacy against him, with a Design to destroy him and seize on his Dominions. *Rezin* had recovered from him *Elatb*, built on the *Red Sea* by *Azarias*, 2 *Kings* xiv. 22. 1 *Kings* ix. 26. and driven the *Jews* from thence, and peopled it with *Syrians*, 2 *Kings* xvi. 5, 6. The *Jews*, by the Loss of *Elatb*, were deprived of the Benefit of the Trade to *Arabia*, and other Parts, whose Merchandises came by the *Red Sea*, and they never after recovered it. *Rezin* had also carried a Multitude of the *Jews* captive to *Damascus*, 2 *Cbron.* xxviii. 5. and at the same time *Pekab*, Son of *Remaliab*, slew in *Judab* a hundred and twenty thousand valiant Men in one Day: and *Zicbri*, one of his Captains, slew *Maaseiab* the King's Son, and the Governor of his House, and his prime Minister of State, ¶ 6, 7. And the Children of *Israel* carried away captive of their Brethren two hundred thousand, Women, Sons, and Daughters; and took much Spoil from them, and brought it to *Samaria*, ¶ 8. But the Captives they set at Liberty, by the Advice of the Prophet *Oded*, and sent them honourably home, ¶ 11, 15.

The two confederate Kings of *Israel* and *Syria*, before they had done all this Mischief to the King of *Judab*, went up together to *Jerusalem*, and besieged *Abaz* in it, 2 *Kings* xvi. 5. But being not able to take the City, which was strongly fortified with Walls and Towers, they returned with their Armies: and *Rezin* marched to *Elatb*, and took it, and sent the People Captives to *Damascus*, and left a Garison of *Syrians* in it: and at the same Time *Pekab* defeated the Army of *Abaz*, with the Slaughter of an hundred and twenty thousand Men; and carried away captive two hundred thousand *Jews*, as observed above. The *Edomites* also came and ravaged the Land of *Judab*, and carried away many Captives: and about the same time the *Philistines* invaded the South Parts of *Judab*, and took several Cities with the Villages belonging to them, and dwelt in them, 2 *Cbron.*

xxviii. 17, 18. So that *Judah* was reduced so low as almost to despair of Deliverance from her Enemies. This was *the Wound of Judah*, which the Prophet *Hosea* speaks of, ch. v. v. 13. which forced *Abaz* to send an Embassy to (26) *Tiglath-Pul-Ajar* King of *Assyria*, with a large Present of Gold and Silver, and a Promise also to be his Servant, and tributary to him, that he might assist him and deliver him out of the Hands of the two Kings his Adversaries, and revenge the Injuries they had done him, 2 *Kings* xvi. 7, 8. Upon this Message the King of *Assyria* came with a great Army, and besieged *Damascus*, the capital City of *Syria*, and took it, and slew *Rezin* the King, and carried the People captive to (27) *Kir* in *Media*, and placed a Colony of *Assyrians* in it, v. 9. and hereby put an end to the *Syrian* Kingdom, which became subject to the *Assyrian* Empire. This happened in the second and third Years of the Reign of *Abaz*, and the Year before *Christ* 740 and 739.

As soon as *Tiglath-Pul-Ajar* had taken *Damascus* and subdued *Syria*, he invaded the Country of the King of *Israel*, and took *Ijon*, and *Abrlbeth-Maachab*, and *Janoab* (which had been invaded and smitten before by *Ben-Hadad*, who was hired by *Asa* to assist him against *Baasha*, 1 *Kings* xv. 18—20.) and *Kedesh*, and *Hazor*, and *Gilead*, and *Galilee*, all the Land of *Naphtali*, also the *Reubenites*, and *Gadites*, and the half Tribe of *Manasses* (that is, the two Tribes and half which were beyond *Jordan*) and carried them captive into

(26) This King is called *Jareb* by the Prophet *Hosea*, ch. v. v. 13. which Word is not the proper Name of a King, as some by Mistake understand it; but the Word signifies *Revenger*, or *to revenge*, and is so rendered by *Jerome* in his Commentary on the Text. *Aquila* renders it *δμαζόμηνος*; *Theodosion*, *κεῖνός*; *Symmachus*, and the *Latin Vulgate*, *ultorem*. *Jerome* remarks, Quod autem *Jarib ultorem* significet et *judicem* nomen *Gedeonis* ostendit: appellatus enim est *Jerobaal*, i. e. *ulciscatur se Baal*.

(27) *Kir* was a City of the *Upper Media*, *Jos. Antiq. Jud.* lib. ix. c. 12. p. 503. And it is called *Media* by the Prophet *Isai.* xxii. 6. compared with ch. xxi. v. 2. *Ptolemæi* *Κεῖλῶα* *Cyrna* *Mediæ* *urbs mediterranea* *ad Mardum* *vel Amardum fluvium* *qui in Mare Caspium exit.* *Bochart. Geog. Sac.* lib. iv. c. 32. p. 293. See *Ptol. Geog.* p. 148. Edit. 1605. And *Tiglath-Pul-Ajar* sending the *Syrian* Captives of *Damascus* into *Media*, shews that the *Medes* in his Reign were subject to the *Assyrians*.

Assyria

Affyria, and brought them unto (28) Halab, and Habor, and Hara, and to the River Gozan, 2 Kings xv. 29. 1 Chron. v. 6. 26. And by these Conquests of Tiglath-Pul-Afar in Syria and the Land of Israel was fulfilled the Prophecy of Isaiab, ch. viii. v. 4. The Riches of Damascus and the Spoil of Samaria shall be taken away before the King of Affyria. Also the Prophecy of Amos, ch. i. v. 4, 5. I will send a Fire into the House of Hazael, which shall devour the Palaces of Ben-Hadad. I will break also the Bar of Damascus — and the People of Syria shall go into Captivity unto Kir.

The King of *Affyria*, by killing *Rezin* and destroying the *Damascene* Kingdom of *Syria*, and spoiling and depopulating many Countries of the King of *Israel*, and carrying his People captive into the Provinces of *Affyria*, did indeed deliver *Abaz* from the Invasion of these two Kings, and severely revenged him of them; but yet, as the Prophet foretold, *Hof. v. 13.* he did not *cure him of his Wound*; any more than his Father *Pul*, when invited by the People of *Israel* to assist and deliver them from the Tyranny of *Menabem*, *did heal their Sicknefs*, as the same Prophet represents it. And *Tiglath-Pul-Afar* was so far from *strengthening Abaz*, that *he distressed him*, *2 Chron. xxviii. 20.* and impoverished him by taking of him all the Silver and Gold that was in the Treasury of the Temple, and in his own Treasury also, which *Abaz* sent to him, and withal agreed to pay him an annual Tribute, *2 Kings xvi. 7, 8. xviii. 7.*

Damascus and *Syria* being now become subject to the *Affyrians* laid the Foundation of an easy Conquest of the Land of *Judæa*, and of the Captivity of the Kingdoms both of *Israel* and *Judah*.

Salman-Afar, called *Enemasar*, *Tob. i. 13.* succeeded *Tiglath-Pul-Afar*. This King completed the Miseries of the ten Tribes of *Israel*,

(21) These Places are thought by some to have lain on the Western Borders of *Media*, between *Affyria* and the *Caspian Sea*. See *Bochart. Prælim. Dissert. de Sit. Paradis. Terrest. Phaleg. p. 29. and p. 194.* *Hara* est *Rages*, *Autor. incerti Quæst. Heb. in lib. Chron. inter oper. Hieron. tom. ii. p. 46.* *Hyde, Hist. Relig. vet. Pers. p. 414.* thinks *Hara* and *Gozan* were two chief Cities of *Media*, but *Habor* or *Chabor* is placed by *Ptolemy* in *Mesopotamia*, near the *Euphrates*, *p. 142.* and *Hara* may be the same with *Haran*, *Charran*, or *Carræ* in *Mesopotamia* likewise.

which

which were begun by his Predecessor : for he invaded *Hoshea* King of *Israel* (who had treacherously slain *Pekah*, and seized the Kingdom, 2 *Kings* xv. 30.) and put him under Tribute, 2 *Kings* xvii. 3. and afterwards finding that he had entered into a secret Confederacy against him with *So* (22) King of *Egypt*, and paid not his annual Tribute as he had done ; he brought an Army, and ravaged all the Land as he marched to *Samaria*, to which he laid Siege, and *Hoshea* was shut up in it three Years ; and in the End of the third Year the King of *Assyria* took the City, and carried *Hoshea* and his People captive into the Provinces of *Assyria* and *Media* : he shut *Hoshea* up in Prison, and placed the People (23) in *Halab*, and in *Habor* by the River of *Gozan*, and in the Cities of the *Medes*, 2 *Kings* xvii. 4, 5, 6. xviii. 9, 10, 11. Thus the Kingdom of *Israel* was utterly destroyed in the Year before *Christ* 721, after it had stood 256 Years.

The Desolation and Captivity of *Israel* was foretold many Years before to *Jeroboam*; by the Prophet *Abijah* the *Sbilonite*. *The Lord* (saies he) *shall smite Israel, as a Reed is shaken in the Water ; and he shall root up Israel out of this good Land — and shall scatter them beyond the River (Euphrates) because they have made their Groves, provoking the Lord to Anger. And he shall give Israel up, because of the Sins of Jeroboam, who did sin, and who made Israel to sin,* 1 *Kings* xiv. ver. 15, 16. And it is probable that *Salman-Azar* beat in pieces and

(22) *Herodotus* calls this King *Sabacon*, lib. ii. c. 137. and *Manetho*, Dynast. 24.

(23) *Hala*, *Halach*, or *Chalach* might be one of the Cities built by *Asbur*, *Gen.* x. v. 11. This is supposed to be *Calab*, situated about the Springs of the River *Lycus*, and mentioned by *Strabo* as the capital City of a Province called *Calacene* ; which seems to be the same with *Ptolemy's* *Calacine*, above *Adiabene* towards Mount *Niphates*, *Ptolem. Geog.* lib. vi. p. 146. See *Borchart's* *Phaleg.* lib. iv. c. 22. *Cellar. Geog.* Tom. ii. p. 663. *Ptolemy* mentions *Chabor*, which seems to be the *Habor* here mentioned amongst the Cities of *Mesopotamia*, and lying near the *Euphrates*, *Geog.* lib. v. p. 142. See Not. 21, above. *Gosan* may be *Ptolemy's* *Gausanitis* in *Mesopotomia* ; or *Gausan*, or *Gausania*, a City of *Media*, *Geog.* lib. v. p. 142. lib. vi. p. 148. *Josephus* saies, the *Israelites* were carried from *Samaria* into *Media* and *Persia*, *Ant. Jud.* lib. ix. c. 14. And the *Oriental Chronicle* published by *Abraham Eccbellensis* makes *Chabor* to be *Asphahan*, p. 19.

carried away the *Golden Calves* which had been set up by *Jeroboam* in *Bethel* and *Dan*, it being usual for idolatrous Conquerors to demolish and carry away the Gods or Idols of those Nations whom they conquered.

And this is intimated by the Prophet *Hoseab*, *The Inhabitants of Samaria shall fear because of the Calves* [rather *Calf* as the Septuagint has it] *of Beth-Aven: for the People thereof shall mourn over it—It shall be carried also unto Assyria for a Present to King Jareb: Ephraim shall receive Shame, and Israel shall be ashamed of his own Counsel. As for Samaria her King is cast off, AS THE FOAM UPON THE WATER*, ch. x. ver. 5, 6, 7. And the Prophet *Micah* foretells to the People of *Israel*, that *all their graven Images shall be beaten to pieces*, ch. i. ver. 7. *Amos* also prophesied, that God would *visit the Altars of Beth-el*, and that *they should fall to the Ground*, ch. iii. ver. 14. and *Beth-el* is threatened with Judgment and Destruction, ch. v. ver. 5, 6. After the *Israelites* were carried away out of their own Land into *Assyria*, as God had foretold by his Prophets, *2 Kings* xvii. ver. 23. that the Land might not be desolate and without Inhabitants; *Salmanasar the King of Assyria brought Men from Babylon, and from (24) Cutbab, and from Ava, and from Hamath, and from Sepharvaim, and placed them in the Cities of Samaria instead of the Children of Israel; and they possessed Samaria and dwelt in the Cities thereof*, *2 Kings* xvii. ver. 24. Some of these Colonies in *Ezra*, ch. iv. ver. 9. are called *Dinaites, Apbarsathcbites, Tarpelites, Apbarsites, Archevites, Babylonians, Sasanchites, Dehavites, Elamites*: which last People are not mentioned in the *Greek Copies*. But these Nations were not sent and placed in the Cities of *Samaria*, ver. 10. by *Asar-Haddon*, as is said ver. 2. in all the Copies; and which Reading is followed by *Archbishop Usher, Sir J. Marsham, Sir I. Newton*, and others: but they were some of the Colonies sent from *Media, Persia, Babylonia, Mesopotamia*, and *Syria*, by *Salmanasar*: and so (25) *Josephus* read it in his Copy of *Esdra*s. They were sent over from the *Assyrian Provinces* under the

(24) *Cutbab* was a Province in *Persia*, so called from the River *Cutbus*. *Joseph. Jud. Antiq. lib. ix. c. 14.*

(25) *Antiq. Jud. lib. xi. c. 2. p. 549. cap. iv. p. 556.*

Command of *Asnappar* or *Assenaphar*, and settled in the Cities of the *Israelites*; and worshiped the God of *Israel* along with their own Idols, 2 *Kings* xvii. ver. 28, 29. 41.

By these Nations possessing the whole Land of *Israel*, the very Name of *Israelites* was abolished, according to the Prophecy of *Isaiab*, ch. vii. ver. 8. who told *Ahaz*, that *within threescore and five Years, Ephraim* (i.e. the Tribes of *Israel*) *should be broken, so as not to be a People*. This was the Term which God had appointed for the Captivity of *Israel*, from the Time that he had sent Prophets to forewarn them of it. The first of these was *Amos*, all whose Prophecies almost declare God's Judgments against the *Israelites* for their Idolatries and Immoralities, and threaten them with utter Destruction. *Amos* began to prophecy in the latter End of the Reign of *Jeroboam* the second, and *two Years before the Earthquake*, which happened in the Year before *Christ* 783, as is most probable; and, as I observed, under the Reign of this (26) King: so he began to prophecy in the Year before *Christ* 785, and *Hoseab* prophesied against the *Israelites* about the same time; and *Isaiab* a few Years after them. Now from the Year before *Christ* 785, when God first foretold the utter Destruction of the Kingdom of *Israel*, and the Captivity of the People of the Land, by *Amos*, to the Year before *Christ* 721, when *Samaria* was taken, and all the People of it, and of the Cities belonging to it, were carried into Captivity; and the Land inhabited by other Nations sent from the *Assyrian* Provinces, is *sixty-four Years*, and so *within sixty-five Years*, as *Isaiab* foretold, *Ephraim was broken from being any more a People*. And this was the Explication of the ancient *Jews*, as (27) *Jerome* relates in his

(26) See the Chronolog. Table of the Kings of *Israel* and *Judah*.

(27) *Hebræi hunc locum ita edisserunt; ut Amos, qui sub Ozia cœpit prophetare, quando et Isaias prophetiæ suæ habuit exordium, primus prophetaverit contra Israel, dicens (cap. vii. ver. 17.) Israel autem captivus ducetur de terra sua. Titulus quoque prophetiæ ejus contra Samariam sit, et prophetare cœperit in diebus Oziæ regis Juda ante duos annos terræ motus:—volunt autem annum fuisse vigesimum quintum Oziæ, quando hæc acciderunt, cujus reliqui anni sunt viginti septem. Ozias enim regnavit annos quinquaginta duos: post eum regnavit Joatham filius ejus annis sedecim; et hujus filius Ahaz annis aliis sedecim; post quem regnavit Ezechias, cujus sexto imperii anno capta Samaria est: atque*

Commentary on the Passage of *Isaiab*, ch. vii. 8. And by this Interpretation the Prophecy was exactly fulfilled; nor do I apprehend that it can be made out any other (28) Way: and especially by a supposed Colony planted in the Cities of *Israel* many Years afterwards by *Afar-Haddon*, and founded on the corrupt Reading of *Ezra*, ch. iv. 2. taken notice of above. And admitting that *Afar-Haddon* had sent a Colony into the Land of *Israel* forty-four Years, as is supposed, after the Captivity of the ten Tribes, how could this be a fulfilling of *Isaiab's* Prophecy, which was fulfilled forty-four Years before? For the *Israelites* were broken and no more a People; after *Salmanasar* had taken *Samaria* and carried them away Captive into *Assyria*. So that I wonder that such learned Men as *Usher* (29), and the great Sir *Isaac Newton*, should acquiesce in an Interpretation of the Prophecy, which is evidently groundless.

After *Salmanasar* had taken *Samaria*, he marched with his Army through *Galilee* into *Pbaenicia*, and invested *Tyre*, in the Reign of *Elukeus*, as *Menander* (30) of *Ephesus* related from the *Tyrian Annals*.

ita effici simul annos sexaginta quinque. Com. in cap. vii. *Isai*. p. 68. *Clariss* is of the same Opinion, ap *Crit. Sac.* tom. iv. annot. in loc. *Isaiæ*, and *Forerius* from *Vatablus*, *ibid*.

(28) *Grotius* and *Cappellus* read in the Text of *Isaiab* six and five Years, instead of sixty-five: and so read in the Hebrew Text *ses*, i. e. *six* in the singular Number for *sesim*, i. e. *sixty* in the plural Number. And they computed from the two last Years of *Pekab*, or the 18th of his Reign, to which the nine Years of *Hoshea* being added made eleven Years, *Crit. Sac.* ubi sup. et *Ludov. Cappel. Crit. Sac.* lib. vi. p. 415 But besides that all Copies read *sixty-five Years*, they did not consider that after the Death of *Pekab* there was an inter-regnum, or Anarchy of nine Years, before *Hoshea* began to reign: for he did not reign till the 12th of *Abaz*, 2 *Kings* xvii. 1. and therefore from the 2^d of *Abaz* and 18th of *Pekab* ending, whence they suppose the Prophet to reckon, it was 19 or 20 Years: viz. 10 or near 11 Years of *Abaz's* Reign, when *Hoshea* began to reign, and nine Years of *Hoshea's* own Reign. So that their Emendation of the Text of *Isaiab*, though ingenious, has no Foundation.

(29) *Annal. vet. Test.* p. 108. ad ann. 677. ant. ær. Christ. Sir I. Newt. *Chronolog.* p. 283.

(30) Apud *Joseph. Antiq. Jud.* lib. ix. c. 14. The *Tyre* which *Salmanasar* invaded, and was not able to take, was evidently *Old Tyre*, for he invested it with a Land-Army first and last; and therefore it could not be the insular

On Occasion of this Invasion, *Sidon*, *Ace* [afterwards called *Ptolemais*, and now *Acon*]. and many other Cities revolted from the *Tyrians*, and put themselves under the Protection of the King of *Assyria*: upon which *Elulæus* made Terms of Peace with *Salmanasar*, probably paying him a great Sum of Money, and *Salmanasar* return'd with his Army into *Assyria*. He soon after renewed the War, in order to make the *Tyrians* submit and become tributary to him, as most of the Cities of *Phœnicia* had done. The *Phœnicians* assisted him with a Fleet of sixty Ships, to enable him to attack the *Tyrians* by Sea as well as Land. The *Tyrians* had only twelve Ships, with which they fought and beat the *Phœnician* Fleet, and took five hundred Prisoners. Upon this Defeat the King of *Assyria* would engage them no more at Sea; but left an Army to block up the City, and returned into *Assyria*. This Army, to distress the *Tyrians* and force them to a Surrender, stopped the Aquæducts by which Water was conveyed from the River into the City: so that the *Tyrians* had no Supply of Water but from Wells which they dug. This Blockade continued for five Years, from which they were delivered by the Death of *Salmanasar*, who died in the Year before Christ 713, if not the Year before.

Salmanasar had all along demanded of *Hezekiah* King of *Judah* the annual Tribute which *Abaz* his Father had agreed to pay to the *Assyrians*; but *Hezekiah* having been prosperous in his Wars against the *Philistines*, he refused to pay the usual Tribute, 2 *Kings* xviii. 7, 8. *Salmanasar* (31) threatened him with an Invasion and Devastation of his Kingdom; and would undoubtedly have made War upon him, if he had not been diverted by his Expeditions into *Samaria*, *Phœnicia*, and *Syria*, and disappointed in his Attempts upon *Tyre*, which kept an Army employed five Years, soon after which he died.

Tyre which was surrounded by the Sea. And yet in the Text of *Josephus*, *Palæ-Tyrus*, or *Old Tyre*, is said to have surrendered with the other *Phœnician* Cities. ἡ πάλαι Τύρος therefore is a corrupt Reading, and I wonder the learned *Usher* did not see that it was so. *Annal. vet. Test. ad an. ante Christ. 717*. I am inclined to think with *Perizonius*, that *Menander* wrote ἡ Βήρυτος. *Orig. Babylon. c. vi. p. 82*.

(31) *Joseph. Antiq. Jud. lib. ix. c. 13. fin. p. 505*.

Senacherib.

Senacherib (32) succeeded his Father *Salmanasar* in the *Assyrian* Empire, *Tob. i. v. 15.* And he no sooner came to the Throne, in the 14th Year of *Hezekiab* King of *Judab*, and in the Year before *Christ* 713, but he invaded *Judæa* with a prodigious Army, to be revenged on *Hezekiab* for having refused to pay the annual Tribute laid upon his Kingdom by *Tiglath-Pul-Asar*, as it was agreed between him and *Abaz*, and had been constantly paid till he came to the Throne of *Judab*. *Senacherib* took several of the fortified Cities of *Judab*, 2 Kings xviii. v. 13. and laid Siege to *Lachish*; intending next to go up with his Army against *Jerusalem*, v. 14. Upon this *Hezekiab* was terrified, and immediately sent Ambassadors to the King of *Assyria*, to beg Pardon for not having paid the annual Tribute, and promising to pay whatever Sum he should lay upon him, if he would go out of his Country. The King of *Assyria* demanded of him three hundred Talents of Silver and thirty Talents of Gold. *Hezekiab* took all the Silver that was in the Treasury of the Temple, and also of his own Palace; and cut off the Gold from the Doors of the Temple, and from the Pillars which he had overlaid, to make up the appointed Sum, and gave it to the King of *Assyria*, v. xiv. 15, 16. *Senacherib* having received the Money left *Judæa* for the present, and marched his Army against the *Egyptians*, to be revenged on that Nation for having confederated with *Hoshea* against his Father *Salmanasar*, 2 Kings xvii. v. 4. He sent *Tartan*, one of his Generals, with an Army to *Ashdod*, or *Azotus*, which he besieged and took, *Isai. ch. xx. v. 1.* whilst he himself proceeded with the main Army, and sat down before (33) *Pelufium*, the frontier City of *Egypt*, with a Design, after he had taken it, to have subdued the whole Kingdom and made it tributary.

After *Senacherib* was gone into *Egypt*, *Hezekiab* fell sick of the Plague; and the Prophet *Isaiab* was sent to acquaint him, that his Di-

(32) Herodot. lib. ii. c. 141. mentions this King, and calls him *Sanacharib* King of the *Arabians* and *Assyrians*. His Father might have conquered Part of *Arabia deserta* which joined to *Chaldea*, or *Herodotus* might mean the *Chaldean Arabians*; or those *Arabians* who dwelt in *Mesopotamia*, and were subject to the *Assyrians* after *Tiglath-Pul-Asar* had conquered *Syria*; and *Salmanasar* had added to these Conquests. See 2 Kings xix. ver. 11, 12, 13.

(33) Herodot. lib. ii. c. 141. and *Berosus* in *Josephus* Antiq. Jud. lib. x. stemper

Remper was mortal, and bid him *set his House in Order, for that he should die and not live*, 2 Kings xx. v. 1. This God did to humble and to try him. And as soon as the Message was delivered, *Hezekiah* prayed heartily to God, and hoped he might obtain Mercy and Deliverance from Death, on account of his Sincerity and Zeal in the true Worship of God, which he had restored and reformed from the Idolatries of his Father *Abaz*, 2 Kings xviii. v. 3, 4, 5, 6.

Before *Isaiab* was got out of the Palace, he was ordered by God to turn back again, and to tell *Hezekiah*, that his Prayers were heard, and that he should be healed immediately; and the Prophet had ordered a Lump of Figs to be laid upon the pestilential Boil, which brake it, and he recovered. God also told him, that he should live and reign fifteen Years longer; and that he would deliver him and *Jerusalem* out of the Hand of the King of *Affyria* (who had purposed in his Return from *Egypt* to destroy them, and was then probably on his March) 2 Kings xx. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. And as he desired to be satisfied of the Truth of what the Prophet had told him by a miraculous Sign, God brought the Shadow of the Sun ten Degrees (34) backward, by which it had gone

c. 1. *Herodotus* calls the King of *Egypt*, who then reigned, *Setbon*; and he is called *Sevec*, or *Sevechus* in *Manetho's* 25th Dynasty.

(34) The Miracle of the Sun's Shadow going back ten Degrees, seems to have been by a miraculous Inflection of the Rays of the Sun only, on the Dial, or Staircase of the Palace of *Abaz*, or *Hezekiah*, which was first made use of for the Observation of the Time of the Day in the Reign of *Abaz*; and not to have been an universal Miracle. For it appears from 2 *Chron.* xxxii. 31. that the Ambassadors of *Merodac-Baladan*, who were sent to compliment *Hezekiah* on his Recovery (2 Kings xx. 12.) were ordered to enquire into the Miracle that was done at the same time. This shews that it had no Effect, nor was observed by the *Chaldean* Astronomers at *Babylon*; but only that they had heard of it there: and the Study of Astronomy being then much improved at *Babylon*, they were desirous to have an Account of so extraordinary a Phænomenon as the Retrogradation of the Sun's Shadow. The Word translated *Dial* is *Megaloth*, the Word which is rendered several Times before *Degrees*; and it means an Ascent or Flight of Steps. So that this *Dial* seems to have been no other than a Staircase in King *Abaz's* Palace, on the Steps of which was marked with Lines the Progress of the Sun's Shadow, shewing the Hours of the Day. So the *Chaldee* Paraphrase and the *Syriac* Version understand it. And *Josephus* saies, the
down

down in the Dial of Abaz, 2 Kings xx. ver. 8—11. Isaiah xxxviii. ver. 7, 8.

Senacherib had spent all the Year in the Siege of *Pelufium*, without being able to take it. *Herodotus* (35) relates, that he was defeated by a vast Number of Field-Mice running into his Camp by Night, which gnawed to pieces the Shield-straps, Bow-strings, and Quivers of his Soldiers; so that in the Morning, finding themselves disarmed, they raised the Siege and fled, with the Loss of many Men, who were slain by the *Egyptians* in their Flight. But *Josephus* (36) gives a more probable Account of the *Assyrians* leaving the Siege of *Pelufium*; namely, that when he had finished his Batteries raised against the Town, and was ready to storm it, News was brought him, that *Tirbakab* King (37) of *Æthiopia* was in full March with a great Army to assist the *Egyptians*; and had resolved to march through the Desert of *Arabia*, and to invade the *Assyrian* Territories. This Account made him suddenly decamp and quit the Siege of *Pelufium*; and leave the Country of *Egypt*. This was in the fifteenth Year of *Hezekiah*, and in the Year before *Christ* 712. *Senacherib*, enraged at his Disappointment in his

Shadow of the Sun went back ten Steps in the House of Abaz, Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 2. These *Hippolytus* understood to be so many Hours; and that this Day had thirty-two Hours, Ap. Annal. Glyc. p. 194.

(35) Lib. ii. c. 141.

(36) Jud. Antiq. lib. x. c. 1. p. 512.

(37) *Josephus* calls him *Tarshish* in the Place above-cited. He is called by *Manetho* *Tarcus*, or *Tarachus*: and by the Septuagint and Latin Vulgate *Taraca*. He was King of *Æthiopia* and *Arabia*, above *Syene*, which was the Boundary between *Egypt* and *Æthiopia*, and his Kingdom reached to the west Side of the *Arabian* Gulf, or Sea. See Cellar. Geog. Antiq. lib. iv. c. 8. p. 952. and Strab. Geog. lib. i. p. 68. He is mentioned by *Strabo*, who calls him *Tearcho* the *Æthiopian* King; and saies, he was related to have marched with an Army as far as the Pillars of *Hercules*, Geog. lib. xv. p. 1007. He was probably the Son of *Sabakon*, and Brother to *Sevechus* King of *Egypt*, whom he came to assist, and succeeded him in the *Egyptian* Kingdom; and is the third *Æthiopian* King who reigned in *Egypt* under the 25th Dynasty of *Manetho*; which see, and the Notes there. And it appears from *Josephus* Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 1. that he was King of the *African* *Æthiopia* above *Egypt*, because he purposed, after fighting *Senacherib*, if he beat him, to have marched directly through the Desert of *Arabia* into the *Assyrian* Territories.

Egyptian

Egyptian Expedition, returned with his Army into *Judæa*, and encamped again at *Lachish*, 2 Chron. xxxii. ver. 9. 2 Kings xviii. ver. 17. And notwithstanding the Treaty of Peace which he had made with *Hezekiah*, he sent *Rabshakeh*, and two other Generals of his Army, with a great Host against *Jerusalem*, 2 Kings xviii. 17. *Rabshakeh* and the other two Officers, called *Tartan* and *Rabsars*, went to *Jerusalem*, and standing near the Wall of the City, delivered the proud and blasphemous Message mentioned 2 Kings xviii. ver. 19, &c. *Isai.* xxxvi. ver. 4, 5, &c. unto the Servants of *Hezekiah*, whom he sent out to them ; demanding a Surrender of *Jerusalem* to the King of *Assyria* ; and endeavouring to persuade the People to revolt, ver. 29, 30, 31. *Hezekiah* had a little before taken Counsel with his Princes and great Men, about putting themselves and the City in a Posture of Defence, as soon as he perceived that *Senacherib* had a Design to fight against *Jerusalem*. The first thing resolved on was to stop up all the Wells which were without the City ; and to divert the Brook which ran by it, another Way ; that, when the *Assyrian* Army came near the City, they should find no Water : this was immediately done by the People, who readily in great Numbers employed their Hands in the Work. He also at the same Time repaired the Breaches of the Wall, and raised it up to the Towers ; and built a new Wall without the other, and repaired *Millo* ; and armed the People, and marshalled them, and set proper Officers over them. Then he ordered them to be all drawn up before him ; and he exhorted them to be courageous, and not to be afraid of the great Army of the King of *Assyria* ; for that their God was more powerful than all his Host, and was ready to help them and to fight their Battles. This Speech encouraged the People, and they resolved to defend the King and City to the last, 2 Chron. xxxii. 2—8. These Preparations for a Defence were made whilst *Senacherib* lay before *Lachish*. But when *Rabshakeh* was come with a great Army before *Jerusalem*, and had delivered the threatening and blasphemous Message which *Eliakim* and the other Officers of the Household repeated to *Hezekiah*, his Courage began to fail him ; he rent his Cloaths and put on Sackcloth, and went into the Temple, and prayed to God to deliver him and his People out of the Hand of the King of *Assyria* :

at the same Time he sent a Message to the Prophet *Isaiab*, to let him know the Danger they were in; and to acquaint him with the reproachful Blasphemies which *Rabshakeb*, by Order of his Master the King of *Assyria*, had uttered against the living God; and to entreat his earnest Prayers to God to spare his People which were left, 2 Kings xviii. y 37. ch. xix. ver. 1, 2, 3, 4. *Isaiab* put up his earnest Prayers to God both for the King and People; and bade the Servants of *Hezekiab* tell their Master *from the Lord*, not to be afraid of the Threatenings of the King of *Assyria*, and of the Blasphemies of his Servants against the God of *Israel*; for that God would *send a Blast upon him; and he should bear a Rumour, and return to his own Land, and fall by the Sword in his own Land*, 2 Kings xix. ver. 6, 7. *Rabshakeb* having delivered his Message; and receiving no Answer from the People to whom he had applied himself, who were resolved to defend the City and their King; and finding that the City was well fortified and able to hold out, he returned to the King of *Assyria*, who had left *Lachish* and was besieging *Libnab*, ver. 8. *Isai.* xxxvii. ver. 8. He had no sooner given *Senacherib* an Account of his Message to *Hezekiab*, but News was brought (as *Isaiab* had foretold) that *Tirbakab* King of *Æthiopia* was in full March to fight against him; being, as is probable, desired by the King of *Egypt* to pursue him, 2 Kings xix. 9. *Isai.* xxxvii. 9. *Senacherib* waited for the coming up of the Enemy, and resolved, after he had defeated him, to march with his whole Army against *Jerusalem*: and in the mean time sent Messengers again with a Letter to *Hezekiab* in the same haughty and blasphemous Style, as he had at first delivered a Message by *Rabshakeb*, 2 Kings xix. ver. 9—13. *Isai.* xxxvii. 9—13. *Hezekiab* having received and read the Letter, went immediately to the Temple, and holding it open in his Hand, he prayed to God to hear the Words of *Senacherib*, with which he had reproached and defied him; and begged that he would make his Power known in all the Kingdoms of the Earth, and that he alone was God, by saving his People out of the Hand of the *Assyrians*, ver. 14—19. As soon as he had done praying, the Prophet *Isaiab* sent to assure him, that God had heard his Prayers; and that the King of *Assyria* should not come before the City or lay Siege to it; and that he would defend and save it

it out of his Hand. And for a Sign of their Deliverance, and that *Senacherib* should leave the Country, and not return again to invade it, he tells them, *they should eat that Year such Things as grew of themselves, and in the second Year that which sprang of the same; and in the third Year they should sow and reap, and plant Vineyards and eat the Fruits thereof.* Accordingly, *that Night the Angel of the Lord went out and (38) smote in the Camp of the Assyrians an hundred fourscore and five thousand Men,* amongst which were *all the mighty Men of Valour and the Leaders and Captains of the Army,* 2 Kings xix. ver. 20. 28, 29. 32, 33, 34, 35. *Isai.* xxxvii. ver. 21. 29, 30. 33, 34, 35, 36. 2 Chron. xxxii. ver. 21.

This Destruction of the *Assyrian* Army was a just Judgment from God upon *Senacherib*, for having blasphemed and defied him to deliver *Jerusalem* out of his Hands. God by this Act of his miraculous Power let him see that he was greater than all the Gods of the Nations, whose Images and Altars had been destroyed by him and his Forefathers, who were by his Providence raised up to punish those idolatrous Countries which they had conquered and wasted: but that he was able to deliver his own People who worshiped him, without human Strength; and to destroy their Enemies how many and potent soever, with the *Blast* of his Mouth; and by one single Messenger of his divine Vengeance.

The Prophet *Hosea* foretold this miraculous Deliverance of the *Jewish* Nation. Having foretold the utter Destruction of the *Israelites* by the Conquest of *Samaria*, ch. i. ver. 6. he adds ver. 7. *But I will have Mercy on the House of Judah, and will save them by the Lord their God, and will not save them by Bow, nor by Sword, nor by Battle, by Horses nor by Horsemen.* They were to be saved by an invisible and immediate divine Power, which remarkably appeared in the Destruction of *Senacherib's* Army, which was ready to have laid siege to *Jerusalem* with an irresistible Force. And the Prophet *Isaiab*, in several Parts of his Prophecies, foretells this extraordinary Deliverance of the *Jews* and De-

(38) *Josephus* thinks that God destroyed the *Assyrian* Army by a raging Pestilence sent amongst them. τῷ Θεῷ λοιμικὴν ἐνσκήψαντος αὐτοῖς τῷ στρατῷ νόσον, καὶ τὴν πρῶτην τῆς πολιορκίας νύκτα. *Antiq. Jud.* lib. x. c. i. fin.

struction of the *Affyrians* at the same time. See ch. x. ver. 24, 25. ch. xiv. ver. 24, 25.

Senacherib being terrified with the Loss of his Army, fled with the small Remainder of it home to *Nineveh*, in great Confusion (2 *Chron.* xxxii. ver. 21.) and Rage: and there barbarously slew many of the *Jews* who were his Subjects, and had been brought Captive thither by *Salmanasar*, and ordered their Bodies to be cast out of the Walls of the City and to lie unburied, as a Revenge for what he had suffered in *Judæa*, *Tob. i.* ver. 17, 18, 19.

The Destruction of so great an Army weakened the Kingdom of *Senacherib*; and he soon became odious and contemptible even in his own Family: and in the Beginning of the Year after he had fled out of *Judæa*, which was the Year (39) before *Christ* 711, his two eldest Sons conspired against him, and slew him whilst he was worshiping in the Temple of *Nisroch* (40) his God: which unnatural Parricide rendering them odious to the People, they were forced (in order to save their

(39) *Senacherib* must have spent more than a Year in his Expeditions, first into *Judæa*, many fortified Cities of which he conquered: and having made Peace with *Hezekiah*, he marched into *Egypt*, and spent all the Year in the Siege of *Pelufium*; and was forced to leave it untaken. After this, in the Year before *Christ* 712, he marched back into *Judæa*, and broke his Treaty with *Hezekiah*; took *Lachish* and after that laid siege to *Libnah*, where his great Army was almost all destroyed: so that it must have been in the End of Summer when he fled out of *Judæa* to *Nineveh*; whither he returned full of Rage and Revenge, and slew many of the *Jews*, and ordered their Bodies to lie unburied behind the Walls of the City: this Cruelty continued some time. *Tobit* buried the dead Bodies of the *Jews* from Time to Time, till he was discovered by a *Ninevite*, who informed against him, and he was forced to fly to save his Life. This by his Account was in the Beginning of the Spring; for he saies, that in less than *fifty-five* Days after he had fled from *Nineveh*, *Senacherib* was slain by two of his Sons: and *Acbiacar* his Brother's Son being made prime Minister to *Asar-Haddon*, he obtained Leave for *Tobit* to return to *Nineveh*; and he came home to his Family in the Feast of *Pentecost*, which was celebrated in the Month of *May*; and so it was in the Year before *Christ* 711. *Tob. ch. i.* 18—22. *ch. ii.* 1.

(40) *Nisroch* seems to be the *Affyrian* God *Saturn* or *Bel*, whose Image was placed in a Shrine, or Ark, called in the *Chaldee* Tongue *Nisra*. See *Kircher's Oedip. Ægypt. tom. i.* p. 379, 380. The *Jews* suppose that the Shrine was made out of a *Nisra*, or Plank of *Noah's* Ark.

Lives) to fly into the Land of *Armenia*, and secured themselves in the Mountains under the Protection of the Præfect of the Province; and *Asar-Haddon*, the youngest Son of *Senacherib*, succeeded him in the Kingdom, 2 *Kings* xix. 37. *Isai.* xxxvii. 38. *Tob.* i. 21.

It is evident from the Words of the Prophet *Isaiab* ch. xxxvii. 30. that the Year in which *Jerusalem* was delivered and *Senacherib's* Army destroyed was Sabbatical; and the following Year seems to have been the Year of Jubilee, which was also a Sabbatical Year. His Words are: *Ye shall eat this Year such as groweth of itself; and the second Year that which springeth of the same: and in the third Year sow ye and reap, and plant Vineyards and eat the Fruit thereof.* Now this Sign and Confirmation of the Deliverance of *Jerusalem* from the *Assyrians* was given to *Hezekiah* in the fifteenth Year of his Reign and in the Year before *Christ* 712. and if we reckon up thence to the End of the first Sabbatical Year which was in the Year before *Christ* 1545 beginning, and 47 Years after the Exodus of the *Israelites* from *Egypt*, and the seventh Year after their entering into the Land of *Canaan*, we shall find that the Year before *Christ* 712 was a Sabbatical Year: and if we reckon the Years of Jubilee from the Year before *Christ* 711 up to the Year before *Christ* 1545 ending, or 1544 beginning, we shall find that the Year 711 was a Year of Jubilee. So there were to the Years 712 and 711 before *Christ* 119 Sabbatical Years, and 17 Years of Jubilee.

Concerning the Year of Jubilee learned Men have varied in their Opinions. Some have thought it to be always the 50th Year, and all agree it was kept as a Sabbatical Year. This is imply'd in the Words of *Moses* *Lev.* xxv. 10. *And ye shall hallow the fiftieth Year.* And this is the Opinion of *Josephus* (41), and *Philo* (42) of *Alexandria*, and of *Eusebius* in his *Chronicon*. But (43) *Scaliger* is positive that *Eusebius* is mistaken, and that the Year of Jubilee was the 49th Year. *Peta-*

(41) *Jud. Ant.* lib. iii. c. 12. p. 184.

(42) *Lib. de Decalogo*, p. 767. edit. *Parif.* 1640. and *De Charit.* p. 704.

(43) *Animadvers.* in *Euseb. Chron.* p. 15. See his *Emendat. Temp.* lib. vii. p. 782, 783.

vias (44) agrees with *Scaliger*, and *Usher* (45) was of the same Opinion. The principal Reason which these learned Men and others give that the Year of Jubilee was not the 50th but the 49th Year, or coincided with the 7th Sabbatical Year, is, that, if the Jubilean Year was the 50th, the Land must rest two Years together, because the Jubilean was a Sabbatical Year: and that this is contrary to the Words of *Moses*, saying, *ŷ 3, 4. Six Years thou shalt sow thy Field, etc. but in the seventh Year shall be a Sabbath of Rest unto the Land, etc.* Now say they, if the fiftieth Year be a Sabbatical Year, as the Year of Jubilee always was, two Sabbatical Years coming together, the Land will not be sown six Years but only five Years in the Interval between every seventh and eighth Sabbatical Year. This is admitted: and therefore *Moses* must be supposed to have mentioned the six Years of Tillage, *etc.* preceding the Sabbatical Year in general, with an Exception to the Jubilean Year following the seventh Sabbatical Year; in which eighth Hebdomad or Week of Years there would be no more than five Years of Tillage. And there was no Hardship to the *Jews* in being obliged to let their Land rest two Years together, or two Years in seven in the Space of fifty Years; because God promised that in every Year preceding a Sabbatical Year, *the Land should bring forth Fruit for three Years, ŷ 21.* So that they could not want Corn, *etc.* in the Sabbatical Years. The Words of *Moses* declaring the Year of Jubilee to be the 50th Year, *ŷ 10, 11.* and also that it was to be a Sabbatical Year, in which they were neither *to sow nor reap* as in every other Sabbatical Year, shews, I think, plainly that it could not be the 49th Year, or the same with the seventh Sabbatical Year: because, if it was, there was no need of a distinct Command to make it a Sabbatical Year, every seventh Year being of course Sabbatical. *Petavius* takes notice of this Objection, but gives no sufficient Answer to it. And as I doubt not but the Jubilean Year was observed by the *Jews* distinct from the other Sabbatical Years; so the Words of the Prophet *Isaiab* above-cited seem

(44) Doct. Tempor. lib. ix. c. 27. See Jo. Cler. Comment. in Lev. xxv. 10.

(45) Annal. Vet. Test.

to me to infer that the Year of *Hezekiah's* Deliverance from the *Assyrians* was a Sabbatical Year: and the following Year likewise, which was the Year of Jubilee. I am also farther of Opinion that the Jubilean Year always followed the seventh Sabbatical Year; and was every 50th Year from the preceding Jubilee inclusive; and so I have reckoned it. The Sabbatical and Jubilean Years being both of them Years of Release and Liberty; the one of *Debts* and *Servants*, *Deut.* ch. xv. and the other of *Lands* and *Houses*, *Lev.* xxv. 13, 24, 31. were very proper Signs of the Deliverance of the *Jews*, and their Country from the Power of the *Assyrians*. Archbishop *Usher* (46) supposes the Year of *Hezekiah's* Deliverance to be a Jubilean Year, which he supposes to have been the Year before *Christ* 710. but then he makes it coincident with the 7th Sabbatical Year, as *Scaliger* and *Petavius* do. If we reckon down from the Sabbatical Year 712 to *Nabuchadnezzar's* taking *Jerusalem* 126 Years after in the Year before *Christ* 586, as will be shewn, we shall find that to be a Sabbatical Year, as the Prophet *Jeremiah* represents it to be, ch. xxxiv. 8—14.

Josephus (47) says that about the Time of the Death of *Senacherib* the *Assyrian* Empire was broken by the *Medes*. It was not entirely broken or overturned, as he seems to think: but a great Breach was made in it by the Defection of the *Medes* (48), *Babylonians* (49), *Armenians*, and other Nations.

I have before shewn that the *Medes* revolted in the Year before *Christ* 711, as is most probable; and having beat the *Assyrian* Army commanded by *Asar-Haddon* gained their Liberty; and became a free and independent Nation. The *Babylonians* followed their Example and revolted under their Vice-Roy *Mardokempad*, as he is called in

(46) *Annal. Vet. Test.* p. 105.

(47) Ἐν τῷ τῷ χρόνῳ συνέβη τὴν Ἰ. Ασσυρίων ἀρχὴν ὑπὸ Μήδων καταλυθῆναι. *Antiq. Jud.* lib. x. c. 2.

(48) Ασσυρίων ἀρχόντων τ' ἄνω Ἀσίης ἐπ' ἕτεα εἴκοσι καὶ πεντακόσια πρῶτοι ἀπ' αὐτῶν Μῆδοι ἤρξαντο ἀπίστασθαι· καὶ πως οὗτοι περὶ τ' ἐλευθερίας μαχεσάμενοι τοῖσι Ασσυρίοισι ἐγένοντο ἄνδρες ἀγαθοί· καὶ ἀποσάμενοι τὴν δελοσιμένην ἐλευθερώθησαν. μὲν δὲ τῆς καὶ τ' ἄλλα ἔθνεα ἐποίησε τῷτὸ Μῆδοις. *Herodot.* lib. i. c. 95, 96. p. 41.

(49) *Mos. Chorenens. Hist. Armen.* lib. i. c. 20.

328 *Chronological Antiquities of the Hebrews.*

Ptolemy's Astronomical Canon ; or *Merodach*, or (50) *Marodach-Baladan*, as he is called in Scripture 2 Kings xx. 12. He is the first King of *Babylon* mentioned in the Sacred History : and was the first who had been properly King of *Babylon*, after the *Babylonians* became subject to the *Assyrians* : though the Præfects of *Babylon*, at least from the Reign of *Nabonassar*, had the Title of Kings, but only as Vice-Roys to the Kings of *Assyria*. *Marodach-Baladan*, upon his having seized the *Babylonian* Kingdom sent Ambassadors with Letters and a Present to King *Hezekiah*, to congratulate him upon his Recovery, for he had heard that he had been sick : and also to enquire about the Miracle of the Sun's Retrogradation. The principal Design of the Embassy seems to have been to engage *Hezekiah* in his Interest, and to assist him against *Asar-Haddon*, in his Usurpation of the *Babylonian* Kingdom and Revolt from the *Assyrians*.

This Embassy from *Marodach-Baladan* was in the Beginning of the Year before *Christ* 710, as may be inferred from 2 Kings xx. 13. where it is said that *Hezekiah* shewed the Ambassadors of the King of *Babylon* all his Treasures of Silver and Gold, and other precious Things. This Silver and Gold *etc.* was all brought to *Hezekiah* after *Senacherib* had lost his Army and was fled out of *Judæa*, as is related 2 Chron. xxxii. 23, 27. and he had before this drained both his own Treasury and the Treasury of the Temple to pay *Senacherib* the Tribute laid upon him : and to make up the Money was forced to cut off the Gold with which the Doors and Pillars of the Temple were overlaid ; which he would not have done, if he had had Silver and Gold enough beside to satisfy *Senacherib*, 2 Kings xviii. 15, 16. So that 'tis evident *Marodach-Baladan* or *Mardokempad* sent his Embassy and Present to *Hezekiah* after the Death of *Senacherib*, and upon his Revolt from *Asar-Haddon* ; and so about the Beginning of the Year before *Christ* 710

(50) He is called *Berodach-Baladan* 2 Kings xx. 12. But the Septuagint read it *Marodach*, and the Syriac Version also, and in *Isai.* xxx. 1. The Hebrew Text and all the Versions have it *Merodach* or *Marodach*. The Error in 2 Kings xx. 12. arose from the Hebrew Copier writing a ב (*Beth*) for a מ (*Mem*), which are Letters of the same Organ, and not much unlike.

Marc-

Marodach lived but about a Year after ; and was succeeded in the Kingdom of *Babylon* by *Arcian* in the Year before *Christ* 709.

Afar-Haddon succeeded his Father *Senacherib* in the *Affyrian* Empire in the Year before *Christ* 711. He is called in the *Greek* of *Tobit* ch. i. 21. *Sacherdon*, and in the *Syriac* Version *Sarchedon*, both omitting the initial A and the *Greek* transposing the Letter α *Cheth*. The *Septuagint* calls him *Ajordan* in 2 *Kings* xix. and last Verse ; and in *Ijaiah* xxxvii. and last Verse : but the *Targum* calls him *Affaradon* agreeably to *Ptolemy's* Canon ; and *Affar-Adon* or *Afar-Adon* seems to be the true Name. It is derived from *Afer* or *Afar*, and *Adon*, two *Affyrian* and *Babylonian* Gods, viz. *Mars* and *Adonis* : or it may signify the Lord *Afer* or *Afar*, i. e. *Mars* : for *Adon* (51) signified Lord.

Afar-Haddon came young to the *Affyrian* Empire, which upon the Death of his Father *Senacherib* was involved in great Confusion and Civil Wars. The *Medes* first revolted and set up a Republican Government ; and soon after the Kingdom of *Babylon* and *Chaldæa* was seized by *Mardokempad* or *Maradac-Baladan* : and it is probable that *Armenia* likewise rebelled by the Instigation of the two Sons of *Senacherib* who had fled thither for Refuge ; and were protected by (52) *Scæordius* the Prefect of that Province. Other Provinces might follow their Examples. So that *Afar-Haddon* had enough to do for many Years to keep the rest of the Provinces quiet, and to secure himself in the Possession of his Kingdom. But being a Prince of a warlike Disposition ; and having strengthened his Kingdom, and put it again in a flourishing Condition ; in the thirty-first Year of his Reign and in the Year before *Christ* 680. he invaded *Babylon* with a great Army in the

(51) Ἀδωνις. δαυὶδ τοῦ Φοινίκων. Hesyc.

(52) *Moses Chorenensis* says : *Parærus*, who assisted *Arbaces* against *Sardanapalus*, was the Son of *Scæordius* : and he says that *Scæordius* was Præfect of *Armenia* in the Reign of *Senacherib*. So that *Moses* seems to have thought that *Parærus* and *Arbaces* lived when the *Affyrian* Empire was destroyed many Years after the Reign of *Senacherib*. And if so, *Scæordius* and his Son *Parærus* must have reigned above an hundred Years. Hist. Armen. lib. i. c. 20, 22.

Time of an Interregnum, and took it, and reduced that Kingdom again under the *Assyrian* Empire: and to prevent another Defection of the *Babylonians* he resided and kept a standing Army at *Babylon*, and reigned there thirteen Years. He is therefore set down in *Ptolemy's* Canon amongst the Kings who reigned at *Babylon*.

Asar-Haddon having conquered and possessed himself of *Babylon*, he began his Expedition against *Æthiopia* (or *Arabia*) and *Egypt*; and ravaged these Countries with his Armies for three Years together, and carried away many Captives out of them: according to the Prophecy of *Isaiab* in the Reign of *Senacherib*; where foretelling this Invasion of *Asar-Haddon* he says: *And the Lord said, Like as my Servant Isaiab hath walked naked and barefoot three Years for a Sign and Wonder upon Egypt and upon Æthiopia, (i. e. Arabia belonging to Egypt) so shall the King of Assyria lead away the Egyptians Prisoners and the Æthiopians Captives, young and old, naked and barefoot, even with their Buttocks uncovered, to the Shame of Egypt, Isai. xx. 3, 4.*

Asar-Haddon having subdued the *Egyptian Arabia* and all *Egypt* as far as *Æthiopia*, as appears from the History of *Judith* c. i. 9, 10. and made the Kingdom tributary; he returned with his Army in the fourth Year of his Reign at *Babylon*, and invaded *Judæa*, in Revenge for the Destruction of his Father's Army there; and in the twenty-first Year of (53) *Manasses* King of *Judab*, which was the Year before *Christ* 677,

(53) The Paschal Chronicle notes upon the twenty-first Year of *Manasses* and the first Year of the twenty-second Olympiad; τὸν Μανασσῆν βασιλέα ἰδεῖν οἱ ἀρχόντες τὸ διωάμενος βασιλεὺς Ασσυρίων αἰχμάλωτον ἔλαβον καὶ ἤγαγεν εἰς Βαβυλῶνα, p. 118. *Petavius* placed the Captivity of *Manasses* in the Year before *Christ* 690, not considering that *Asar-Haddon* King of *Assyria* did not reign at *Babylon* till the Year before *Christ* 680, and he could not carry *Manasses* captive to *Babylon* before he had conquered it and reigned there. And that *Asar-Haddon* was the King who took *Manasses* Prisoner is evident, because it is said, the Captains of the Host of the King of *Assyria* took *Manasses* Prisoner, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11. See *Petav. Doct. Temp.* lib. xii. c. 26. and lib. xiii. p. 548. *Usher* placeth the Captivity of *Manasses* rightly in the Year where I have placed it from the Paschal Chronicle. But the Paschal Chronicle following *Eusebius* has placed the Olympiads wrong: and it was the last Year of the twenty-fifth Olympiad when *Manasses* was carried

having

having ravaged the Country, he took *Manasses* Prisoner, who had fled and hid himself *amongst Thorns, and bound him with Fetters and carried him to Babylon*, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11. Our Translation saies, that *Manasses* was *taken amongst the Thorns*; but the Septuagint renders it, they took him (54) *in Chains*; and the Latin Vulgate nearly follows the Greek Version. *Josephus* saies, he was taken by a Stratagem; and the Syriac and Arabic Versions say he was taken *alive*; which seems to be the true Sense.

How long *Manasses* continued a Prisoner at *Babylon* is not said in Scripture; but the Paschal (55) Chronicle saies, he continued there to the 36th Year of his Reign, that is, fifteen Years; and so to the Year before *Christ* 662, which was five Years after the Death of *Asar-Haddon*. And if this was the true Year of his Return from his Captivity, it is remarkable that it was the Year of *Jubilee*.

Manasses having repented of his great Impieties, Idolatry, and other Wickedness; and made a League with the succeeding King of *Affyria* to become his Vassal and Tributary, he was sent home to *Jerusalem*: and having abolished all idolatrous Worship both out of the Temple and all other Parts of his Kingdom, he reigned in Peace and Prosperity all the rest of his Days, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 13—18.

captive to *Babylon*: and *Eusebius* has erred fifteen Years in his Position of the Olympiads to the Reign of *Jotham*, or making them commence in the fiftieth Year of *Azariah*, that is, he has carried the Reigns of these Kings of *Judah* fifteen Years too high.

(54) The Septuagint has it, κατέλαβον τὸν Μανασσῆ ἐν δεσμοῖς. The *Hebrew* Word *Hobim* [חֹבִים] signifies *Thorns*, as it is rendered in our *English* Bibles: but the Septuagint read *Habim* [חַבִּים] which signifies either *Hooks* or *Chains*: and from the first Sense *Josephus* rendered it by δέλω, Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 3. and from the latter the vulgate *Latin*, or *Jerome* rendered it *Catenis*. But the best Sense seems to be that of the *Syriac* and *Arabic* Versions: which render the Text, *they took Manasses alive*: and so instead of the present Reading *Babobim* [בַּבּוֹבִים] they seem to have read *Babajim* [בַּבַּיִם] *in vita* or *in vivis*, i. e. *vivum*.

(55) Ὑπέσχεψε πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπεκατέσθη εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ. Ad an. regni 36. p. 118. edit. Paris. ἰσορεῖται παρὰ Αἰθιοπῶν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ λέγειν τὴν ὁδὸν τὸν Μανασσῆν τὰ δεσμά διερράγησαν σιδηρὰ ὄντα, καὶ ἔφυγεν, Lib. iii. Com. Pet. Lambec. Cæsar. Bibliothecar. p. 39. e Cod. MS. Vindobon. inter Theolog. Gr. 25. apud Fabric. Bibliothec. Gr. tom. ii. p. 739.

In the reign of *Asar-Haddon* the *Assyrian* Empire seems to have recovered its former Greatness; containing under it *Assyria*, *Babylonia*, *Chaldæa*, *Mesopotamia*, *Persia*, *Elymais*, *Cilicia*, all *Syria* with *Phœnicia*, *Egypt* and *Arabia* belonging to it, and *Judæa*, *Pontus* and *Cappadocia*, as far as the River *Halys*, which divided the *Assyrians* from the *Lydian* Kingdom; and many Provinces in the North East Parts of the upper *Asia*. This Greatness of the *Assyrian* Empire appears from the History of *Judith*, when *Nabuchodonosor*, probably the Grandson of *Asar-Haddon*, in his War with *Arphaxad* King of the *Medes*, had under him *all that dwelt in the Hill Country, and all that dwelt by Euphrates and Tigris and (56) Jadason, in the Plain of Arioch; the King of the Elymæans, and very many Nations of the Sons of Chelod, who assembled themselves to the Battle.* At the same time he sent Ambassadors (to demand Auxiliaries) unto *all that dwelt in Persia, and to all that dwelt Westward; and to those that dwelt in Cilicia, and Damascus and Libanus and Antilibanus, and to all that dwelt upon the (Mediterranean) Sea-Coast: and to those amongst the Nations that were of Carmel and Galaad and the higher Galilee, and the great Plain of (57) Esdrelon. And to all that were in Samaria and the Cities thereof; and beyond Jordan unto Jerusalem. And (58) Betane and (59) Chellus and Kades (Barnea in the Coast of Edom, Num. xx. 14.) and the River of Egypt: and Taphnes and Rameffe and all the Land of Gesem (or Gosen, Gen. xlvii. 1.) until you come beyond Tanis and Memphis; and to all the Inhabitants of Egypt, untill you come to the Borders of*

(56) Instead of *Jadason* the Septuagint Version has *Hydaspes*, which must be a wrong Reading. I think this River was *Choaspes*, which ran through the Plain of *Sufiana*, called here *Arioch*: the *Elymæans* being next mentioned favours this Conjecture.

(57) *Esdrelon*, cujus fit mentio *Judith*, c. i. 8. c. iv. 6. c. vii. 3. erat in *Galilæa* inferiore in tribu *Zabulon* juxta *Dothain* et *Bethuliam*, a qua et nomen accepit planities illa magna *Galilææ*, quæ *Judith*, c. i. 8. dicitur *campus magnus Esdrelon*. Apud *Onomast. S. Script. Euseb. vide Reland. Palæst. tom. i. p. 369, 370.*

(58) Ἀντὶ τῆς βασιλείας, ἣν οὖν καλεῖται Βάβυλῶνα. It was in the Land of *Galaad*, and in the Tribe of *Manasses*, *ibid. voc. Bafan.*

(59) *Grotius* places *Chellus* in *Palmyrene*. And there *Ptolemy* placeth it, and calls it *Cholle*, *Geog. p. 139.*

Æthiopia

Æthiopia, *Judeth*, c. i. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. Many of these Countries were conquered by *Ajar-Haddon*, and made tributary to the *Assyrians*. *Ajar-Haddon* died at *Babylon* (as is probable) in the Year before *Christ* 667.

It does not appear from Scripture who succeeded *Ajar-Haddon* in the *Assyrian* Empire; but *Saosducon* succeeded him in the *Babylonian* Kingdom, which was now again subject to the *Assyrians*. It seems to me most probable, that *Ninus* the second, who is related by *Castor* (60) to have succeeded his Father *Sardanapalus*, who seems to be the *Ajar-Haddon* of Scripture, was the Son of *Ajar-Haddon*, and succeeded him in the *Assyrian* Empire at *Nineveh*. He reigned twenty-six Years; and *Nabuchodonosor* his Son succeeded him in the Year before *Christ* 641. And *Chiniladan* succeeded *Saosducon* at *Babylon*, in the Year before *Christ* 647.

Nabuchodonosor is said to reign in *Nineveh* in the Days of *Arphaxad*, who reigned over the *Medes* in *Ecbatane*: and who had fortified that City, which was the Capital of *Media*, with strong and high Walls of hewn Stone, and with lofty Towers and Gates, to secure it against the Invasion of the *Assyrians*, *Judith*, c. i. 1, 2, 3, 4.

Phraortes the Son of *Dejoces*, and second King of *Media*, began to reign at *Ecbatana* in the Year before *Christ* 647, and had reigned six Years when *Nabuchodonosor* began to reign over *Assyria* at *Nineveh*. And so it is evident that he was the *Arphaxad* of *Judith*. *Arphaxad*, or *Phraortes*, was a warlike Prince, and not being (61) contented with the *Median* Kingdom alone, which was left him by his Father, he resolved to enlarge it. First of all he invaded *Persia* and conquered it, and made it subject to the *Medes*: and being Lord both of *Media* and *Persia*, two powerful Nations, he afterwards invaded and subdued several other Provinces of *Asia* which belonged to the *Assyrian* Empire. This alarmed the King of *Assyria*, who in the *twelfth* Year of his Reign declared War against *Arphaxad*; and purposed to have overwhelmed him at once with the Forces of his whole Empire. But the Provinces

(60) Apud Syncel. Chronograph. p. 205.

(61) Herodot. lib. i. c. 102.

of *Cilicia*, *Syria*, *Phœnicia*, *Moab*, *Ammon*, *Judæa*, and *Egypt*, refused to send him any Forces, *Judith* ch. i. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. So that he deferred the War till the seventeenth Year of his Reign : and *Pbraortes*, or *Arphaxad*, finding so great a (62) Defection in the *Assyrian* Provinces from *Nabuchodonosor*, was resolved to give the *Assyrians* Battle, who were marched out against him with a great Army. The Battle was fought near *Ragau*, or *Rages* (63), one of the largest Cities of *Media* ; and *Nabuchodonosor* obtained a complete Victory. The greatest Part of the Army of *Arphaxad*, or *Pbraortes*, fell in the Field ; and he himself was taken and slain the same Day, *Judith* ch. i. 13. 15. *Herodotus* gives the same Account. Upon the Defeat of the Army of *Pbraortes*, *Nabuchodonosor* became Master of *Ragau*, and many other of the Cities of *Media* : he took also *Ecbatana*, and demolished the Fortifications and sumptuous Buildings of it ; and then returned with his Army to *Nineveh*, and rested and feasted with his Army for an hundred and twenty Days, *Jud.* i. 14, 15, 16. This famous Battle was fought in the latter End of the seventeenth Year of the Reign of *Nabuchodonosor*, in the Year before *Christ* 625, and in the Month of *November* or *December* : as appears by comparing *Judith*, ch. i. 16. with ch. ii. 1.

Nabuchodonosor having rested and refreshed his Army four Months at *Nineveh* ; he sent his General *Olophernes* with a great Army to avenge himself on all the Western Nations who had disobeyed his Orders, and refused to assist him in the *Median* War. *Olophernes* went forth with an Army of twelve thousand Horse, and an hundred and twenty thousand Foot, *Jud.* ch. ii. 5. 15. and reduced *Cilicia*, *Mesopotamia*, *Syria*, *Damasc-*

(62) Ἐς ὃ στραδύσάμενος ἐπὶ τὰς Ασσυρίδας, ἢ Ασσυρίαν τέτρε αἱ Νῆον ἔχον, καὶ τρεχόν πρέτερον πάντων· τότε δὲ ἦσαν μεμνημένοι μὲν συμμάχων, ὅτε ἀπεσεύων, ἄλλως μὲντοι ἐαυτῶν ὥς ἔχοντες. *Ibid.* This agrees exactly to the History of *Judith*.

(63) This City is called *Ραγεία* by *Ptolemy*. *Ράγα πόλις ἐν Μηδίᾳ*, *Steph. Byzant.* *ῥάγα* *Diod. Sic. lib. xix. p. 352.* and *Arrian. expedit. Alex. lib. iii.* It might be built by *Ragau* (*Gen. xi.*) and called after his Name, as *Dr. Hyde* thinks, *Hist. Rel. vet. Pers. c. ii. p. 55.* It was one Day's Journey from the *Caspian Pyle*, *Arrian. Expedit. Alex. lib. iii. p. 208.* *Strabo* calls it *ῥάγα* ; and *Rageia* was built by *Seleucus Nicator*, where the old *Raga* was. *Cellar. Geog. Antiq. p. 669.* *Strab. Geog. lib. xi. p. 796.* *Isidore Characenus* calls it *Rage*, and saies it was the largest City of *Media*. In *σαθμ. παρθιν. p. 187.*

cus, and Part of *Arabia*, and *Ammon* and *Edom* and *Madian* : and then marched into *Judæa* and besieged *Bethulia*, where he was slain in his Tent by *Judith*, and his Army routed by the *Jews*.

Herodotus (lib. i. c. 102.) has preserved the History of the War between *Nebuchodonosor* and *Arphaxad*. He tells us, that the King of *Assyria*, who reigned at *Nineveh*, was invaded by *Pbraortes* the second King of the *Medes*, at a Time when several Provinces revolted from him ; and that in this War *Pbraortes* was slain in Battle with most Part of his Army. This Account entirely agrees with the History of *Judith* ; and is a great Confirmation of the Truth of it ; and the Time is fixed by the Reign of *Pbraortes*.

They who (64) suppose *Dejoces* the Father of *Pbraortes* to be the *Arphaxad*, and *Saosducon* to be the *Nabuchodonosor* of *Judith*, are altogether mistaken. For *Saosducon* was only King of *Babylon*, which was subject to the *Assyrians* ; but *Nabuchodonosor* was King of *Assyria*. Besides, they did not consider, that it is not probable that *Dejoces*, in his old Age, having reigned forty Years in Peace, and being about ninety Years of Age, should wage War against so powerful a Prince as the King of *Assyria* then was, with the Forces only of the *Median* Kingdom ; for (65) *Herodotus* tells us, that he ruled only over *Media* : nor can we easily suppose so great a Defection of the tributary Nations and Subjects of the *Assyrian* Empire to have happened so soon after they were conquered and reduced by *Ajar-Haddon*. This Opinion is also inconsistent with the Account of *Herodotus* concerning *Dejoces*, whom he speaks of as dying at *Ecbatana* in Peace. But the History of *Judith* suits exactly to *Pbraortes*, who was an ambitious and warlike Prince, as *Arphaxad* is said to be, who had conquered many Nations, Jud. ch. i. 1. according to the Translation of *Jerome* from the *Chaldee* Copy of the Book of *Judith*. Agreeably to this, *Herodotus* tells us, that *Pbraortes* had greatly enlarged the *Median* Kingdom by the Conquest of (66) *Persia*, and several Nations of the upper *Asia*, by which he was able to maintain a War with the *Assyrians*.

(64) Usser. Annal. vet. Test. p. 110, etc. Prideaux's Connex. of the Hist. of the Old and New Test. etc. Part i. vol. i. b. i. p. 49, 50, etc. Petav. Doct. Tempor. lib. xii. c. 26.

(65) Lib. i. c. 101.

(66) Lib. i. c. 102.

The only Argument which Dr. *Prideaux* alledges for making *Dejaces* the *Arpbaxad* of *Judith*, is his being said (he thinks) to be that King of *Media* who was the Founder of *Ecbatana*, *Jud.* i. 2. But it is not there said that he built the City (67) *Ecbatana*; but only that he *built in it Walls round about of brown Stones, and* fortified it with high and strong *Gates and Towers*, ver. 2, 3, 4. And *Jerome's* Translation, which supposes *Arpbaxad* to be the Founder of *Ecbatana*, disagrees both with the *Greek* and *Syriac* Versions, and with *Herodotus*; and probably was the Mistake of the Writer of the History.

From the foregoing Account it appears, that the History of the Book of *Judith* belongs to the Reign of *Josiah*, and the Year before *Christ* 625, and after. It was a few Years after his Reformation in *Judah* and *Jerusalem*, which he began in the 12th Year of his Reign, 2 *Chron.* xxxiv. 3, etc. It is said that when *Olofernes* was come with the *Assyrian* Army upon the Borders of *Judæa*, a little before he besieged *Bethulia*; the *Jews* were exceedingly afraid of him, and were troubled for *Jerusalem*, and for the Temple of the Lord their God, [for they were newly returned from the Captivity, and all the People of *Judæa* were lately gathered together: and the Vessels, and the Altar, and the House were sanctified after the Profanation.] *Jud.* iv. 2, 3. The third Verse is omitted in *Jerome's* Translation: and also the Words of *Achior* in the 5th Chapter and 18th Verse, viz. *and the Temple of their God was cast to the Ground*. And these seem to be plainly Interpolations of the corrupted Copies of this History which *Jerome* mentions in the Preface to his Translation. And they seem to have been inserted in order to intimate the Time when the Matter of the History was supposed to be transacted. But the Time is plainly intimated in the History itself, ch. iv. 6. where it is said, that (68) *Eliachim* the High Priest which was

(67) *Ctesias* always wrote this Word (*Ἀγβάτανα*) *Agbatana*, as *Stephanus Byzant.* saies, voc. Perhaps the *Persians* so called it.

(68) The *Greek* Copy calls him *Josakim*: and he is also so called in *Jerom's* Translation, ch. xv. 9. and in the *Syriac* Copy likewise, both which call him *Eliakim* or *Eliachim* in the rest of the Book. The Reason of this promiscuous Use of the Name seems to be what Dr. *Prideaux* has observed; namely, that both Words are of the same Signification: *El* is the Name of God in

in those Days in Jerusalem wrote to them that dwelt in Bethulia, etc. to guard the narrow Passages of the Hill-Country; which were the Inlet into Judæa, & 7. which they accordingly did, and thereby hindered the Army of Olofernes from passing that Way.

The Letters were wrote in the Name of the King and Senate or Sanhedrim of *Jerusalem*, to whom and the High-Priest *Eliachim* or *Eliakab*, as *Josephus* (69) calls him, (and who in our Translation is called *Hilkiab* 2 *Chron.* xxxiv.) the King who was young committed the Affairs of the Government, and did every thing (70) by their Advice and Counsel.

Archbishop *Usher*, *Petavius*, *Huetius*, and Dr. *Prideaux* are all evidently mistaken in placing the History of *Judith* in the Reign of *Manasses* King of *Judah* and of *Dejoces* King of *Media*: but *Petavius* (71) and *Huetius* are right in making *Nabuchodonosor* one of the Posterity or Successors of *Ajar-Haddon*; and the King of *Babylon* tributary and subject to him. The learned *Ludovicus Cappellus* (72) has made several Objections against the History of *Judith*, which are frivolous; and some of them plain Mistakes of his own; and weakly concludes that the whole History is a Fiction. There may be a few Mistakes in it, the principal of which is, that *Judith* is said to have lived an *hundred and five Years*; and that *there was none that made the Children of Israel any more afraid in the Days of Judith, nor a long Time after her Death*, ch. xvi. 23, 25. This is by no means consistent with the History of the *Jews*. For as we cannot well suppose *Judith* to have been more than thirty Years of Age, when she captivated *Olofernes* with her Beauty; so, if she lived seventy-five Years after that, she must have seen the Desolation of the City and Temple of *Jerusalem*, and the Captivity of the whole *Jewish* People,

one as *Jab* or *Jehovah* is in the other; and the latter Part of the Name is the same in both. Thus *Joakim* King of *Judah* is called also *Eliakim*. See *Connex. B. i. p. 53.*

(69) *Ἐλιακίαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα.* *Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 4.*

(70) *Joseph. ibid.*

(71) See *Petav. Doct. Temp. lib. xii. c. 26.* *Huet. Dem. Evang. p. 366.*

(72) *Not. crit. in Jud. p. 576.*

in the Reign of *Nabuchadnezzar*. The Opinion of the learned Mr. *Whiston* that the History of *Judith* belongs to the Reign of *Darius Hystaspis* is altogether without Foundation. For it was whilst *Nineveh* was the Seat of the *Assyrian* Kings; and whilst the *Babylonians*, *Elymæans*, *Syrians*, *Phœnicians*, *Cilicians* and *Egyptians*, etc. were tributary and subject to them. It was when the *Median* Empire was in being: none of which could possibly be in the Reign of *Darius* King of *Persia*. For long before this Time *Nineveh* had been destroyed; and both the *Assyrian* and *Median* Empires were overthrown and extinguished: and the *Persians*, instead of being subject to either of them, had conquered them both, and were Lords over all the Nations of the East and West from the *Hellepont* to the River *Indus*, as Dr. *Prideaux* rightly observes. Mr. *Whiston* was deceived by the *Apostolic* (73) *Constitutions* calling the King, in whose Reign *Judith* flourished, *Darius*; which was a common Name of the *Median* Kings, and signified the (74) *Conqueror* or *Subduer*; as *Xerxes* and *Artaxerxes*, common Names of *Persian* Kings, signified *Warrior* and *the great Warrior*: and so they might mean *Cyaxares*, or his Son *Astyages*, in both whose Reigns *Judith* lived; and *Astyages* is called *Darius* in the Book of *Daniel* ch. v. 31. and ch. vi. 1. It was in the second Year of *Cyaxares* when *Judith* having slain *Olofernes* delivered the *Jews* from the *Assyrians*. The Argument used by Mr. *Whiston*, that *Olofernes* General of the *Assyrian* Army is a *Persian* Name, is of no Force: because *Elymais* and *Susiana* Provinces of *Persia* were subject to *Nabuchodonosor*, and joined him with their Forces, *Jud.* i. 6. And the Army consisted of both *Medes* and *Persians* as well as of other Nations, ch. xvi. 10. So that he might make a *Persian* of known Valour, [for the *Persians* were a warlike People] the chief Commander of his Army: But *Olofernes* is as much a *Median* Name as a *Persian*. Nor is the

(73) Lib. viii. c. 2. p. 394.

(74) Herodotus says; Διῶα δὲ καὶ Ἑλλάδα γλώσσαν ταῦτα τὰ ὀνόματα, Δαρείος, Ἐξείης. Ξέρξης, Ἀρτίος Ἀρταξέρξης, μέγας Ἀρτίος. τῆς δὲ τῆς βασιλῆας ὡς αὐτοὶ ὀνόματι καὶ γλώσσῃ τὴν σφετέρην ἑκάστης καλέοιεν, Lib. vi. cap. 98. p. 396. And *Suidas* calls *Cyaxares*, or *Astyages* by the Name of *Darius*. For he says *Teales* foretold the Eclipse of the Sun, which happened (ἔπ' Δαρείου) in the Reign of *Darius*; by whom he probably meant *Astyages*. Voc. Θαλής.

Command

Command of *Nabuchodonosor* to *Olofernes* to require of the *West Countries* (he was to make War against) *Earth and Water*, Jud. ii. 17. in Token of their Submission to his Armies, any Argument of his being a *Persian* King. For if this Verse is genuine, which is omitted with the following to the 14th in *Jerome's* Translation; it only shews that the *Persian* Custom of demanding *Earth and Water* of the Countries they warred against, in Token of their Submission and owning them for their Masters, was derived from the *Assyrians* to the *Medes* and *Persians*: and *Plutarch* represents it to have been a Custom of the *Medes* [De vitando ære alieno, p. 128. where by a Mistake of the Copier he has $\omega\tilde{\upsilon}\rho$, *Fire*, for $\gamma\tilde{\lambda}\omega$, *Earth*.]

Nabuchodonosor having received a total Defeat of his Army by the *Jews* before *Bethulia* with the Loss also of his General *Olofernes*, was not able to prosecute his Conquests, or to keep the *Medes* in Subjection: and died soon after about the Year before *Christ* 622 or 621, and was succeeded in the *Assyrian* Empire by his Son *Sarac*, the second *Sardanapalus*: and *Nabopolassar* succeeded three or four Years before in the Year before *Christ* 625 in the *Babylonian* Kingdom, and was the Father of *Nabuchadnezzar*. *Sarac* or *Sardanapalus* was a most weak and effeminate Prince; who neglected the Affairs of the Empire and lived altogether amongst his Women in Sloth and Luxury; and soon became contemptible amongst his Subjects. *Cyaxares* Son of *Phraortes* succeeded his Father in the Kingdom of *Media* in the Year before *Christ* 625, and after the Defeat of the *Assyrian* Army under *Olofernes* recovered in a little Time all that his Father had lost both in *Persia* and the *Upper Asia*. He was the first who (75) divided the Forces of his Kingdom into distinct regular Bodies: and having gained over all the Provinces of *Upper Asia* as far as the River *Halys* (76), he

(75) Herodot. lib. i. c. 103.

(76) Herodot. ibid. The History of *Judith* gives great Light to this Account of *Herodotus*. For it does not appear from him, how *Cyaxares* so soon after the Defeat and Death of his Father *Phraortes* and the Ravage of his Country by the *Assyrians* could gain over the Provinces of the *Upper Asia*, who were subject to the *Assyrians*, and be Master of so great an Army as to fight and defeat the *Assyrians*: but this is clearly solved by the History of

marched with all his Forces against *Nineveh*, both to revenge the Death of his Father ; and with a Design to take and destroy that City. But having beat the *Affyrians* and begun to besiege *Nineveh*, he was obliged to raise the Siege and to return into his own Country, to defend it against a vast Army of *Scythians* led by their King (77) *Madys* from the Parts about the *Lake Mæotis*, in Pursuit of the *Cimmerians* (78),

Judith, and the Account there given of the great Destruction of the *Affyrian* Army with the Death of *Olofernes* the General. Upon this it was that the Provinces of *Upper Asia* came over to *Cyaxares* ; and by their Assistance enabled him to make War upon the *Affyrians* and to beat them. The Light which the History of *Judith* and *Herodotus* give to each other, greatly confirms the Truth of both of them : and the Time of the History of *Judith* is fixed with great Certainty.

(77) This *Scythian* or *Gotbic* King is called *Mader*, or *Her-Mader*, i. e. *Lord Mader*, in the *Sveogotbic Chronicle* at the End of the Life of *Theodoric* by *Cocbleus*, *Stockholm* 1699. p. 622. *Strabo* Geog. lib. xv. in the Beginning mentions from *Megasthenes* this *Scythian* Invasion and Conquest of the *Upper Asia* : but calls the King *Idantbyrsus* ; as *Arrian* also does, *Rer. Indic.* lib. p. 518. but calls him *Indatbyrsus*. But this is a Mistake ; and *Herodotus* makes *Indatbyrsus* live after the Time of *Anacharsis*, and many Years after his Return from *Greece*, lib. iv. c. 76. *Anacharsis* went into *Greece* in the 47th Olympiad, in the Year before *Christ* 592, when *Eucrates* was Archon ; as *Diogenes Laertius* (p. 26.) relates from *Soficrates* : and he stayed many Years in *Greece*. *Herodotus* had his Account from *Timnes* the Tutor of *Spartapitbus*, who was of the Family of the *Scythian* Kings : and *Indatbyrsus* by this Relation was the Son of *Saulius* the King who slew *Anacharsis* : and was the *Scythian* King called by *Clemens Alexandrinus* [*Strom.* v. p. 671.] from *Pberocydes Syrus*, *Idantburas*, who reigned over the *Gotbic Scythians*, and was engaged in the War with *Darius Hystaspis*, when he made an Expedition against the *Scythians* about the Year before *Christ* 512 : and was forced to fly out of their Country. See *Herodot.* lib. iv. c. 120, etc. *Ctesias* calls him *Scytharces*, apud *Pbot.* Excerpt. Hist. Persic. And the Account of *Herodotus* agrees with the old *Sveogotbic Chronicle* at the End of the Life of *Theodoric*, p. 623. So *Indatbyrsus* reigned above an hundred Years after the *Scythian* Invasion of *Media*.

(78) The *Cimmerians* fled into the *Lesser Asia*, and in the Reign of *Ardyis* took *Sardis* all but the Castle, *Herodot.* lib. i. c. 15. and continued there and in *Lydia*, till they were driven out of *Asia* by *Halyattes* the Second, *ibid.* c. xvi. *Strabo* from *Callinus* an ancient Poet mentions the Invasion and taking of *Sardis* by the *Cimmerians*, *Geogr.* lib. xiv. p. 958. They were

whom

whom they had driven out of *Europe* into *Asia*; and passing by Mount *Caucasus* on their Right, they penetrated (through the Defile called *Portæ Caucasæ*) into *Media*. The *Medes* met and gave them Battle, but were defeated by the *Scythians*; who dispossessed them of all the *Upper Asia*, which lay beyond *Media*, and settled and reigned there in a very arbitrary and tyrannical manner for (79) twenty-eight Years.

This *Scythian* Invasion happened about the Year before *Christ* 624. The *Scythians* having seized upon the Kingdoms of *Parthia* and (80) *Persia* and other Provinces of the *Upper Asia*; they marched thence with a great Army directly towards *Egypt*, with a Design to subdue and ravage it; but (81) *Psammitichus* King of *Egypt* met them in *Palestine Syria* near the Border of *Egypt*, and with Entreaties accompanied with large Presents prevailed with their Leaders to proceed no further. In their Return they seized on (82) *Bethshean* or *Beth-*

probably driven out of the *Lesser Asia* about the same Time that *Cyaxares* drove the *Scythians* out of the *Upper Asia* in the Year before *Christ* 596.

(79) Herodot. lib. i. c. 103, 104. lib. iv. c. 1, 12. lib. vii. c. 20. Justin and Trogus relate that the *Scythians* in this Expedition stayed in *Asia* no longer than *eight Years*, lib. ii. c. 5. But the Account of *Herodotus* lib. iv. c. 3, 4. supposes the Term to be not less than twenty-eight Years. For he says that the *Scythian* Women after the Absence of their Husbands for some Time, married their Slaves and had Children by them, who were grown Men and opposed their Return with Arms. The Account of *Trogus Pompeius* might be taken from *Ctesias*: and it agrees better with the Account of the War which the *Scythians* at their Return home had with their Slaves, who opposed with Arms their Passage into their Country: and whom, when they could not conquer them with their Swords, they fell upon with *Horse-Whips*, which put them in mind of their servile Condition, and made them flee. This Relation is more suitable to those Slaves, whom they had left behind them when they went and settled in *Asia*; than to the Sons which their Wives despairing of their Husbands Return had by them. And if the *Scythians* stayed no longer than eight Years in *Asia*, it is easier to account for the Progress of the *Median* Arms and Victories and the Recovery of their Dominions in *Upper Asia* before *Nineveh* was taken and the *Assyrian* Empire destroyed, as *Herodotus* himself supposes, lib. i. c. 106.

(80) Herod. lib. iv. c. 119.

(81) Herod. lib. i. c. 105.

(82) Syncellus (p. 214.) by Mistake calls this City *Basan*. But it was *Bethshean* or *Bethsan* mentioned *Jos.* xvii. 1. *Jud.* i. 27. And by *Josephus*,

san

Jan, a City in the Tribe of *Manasses* on this Side *Jordan*, and kept Possession of it, and it was called from them *Scythopolis*.

They did no other Damage in the Country ; only a few Stragglers, as they passed through the Land of the *Philistines* robbed the (83) Temple of *Venus* or *Astarte* at *Ascalon*.

After the *Scythians* returned into *Asia*, they settled in *Parthia* and *Bactria*, and others of them in *Persia* ; and they are said to have been the Founders of the *Parthian* and *Bactrian* Kingdoms. [Just. lib. ii. c. 1.] *Cyaxares* not being able to drive them out of the *Upper Asia* was forced to come to Terms with them, and let them live as they pleased in the Provinces they had seized. And they for many Years prevented his designed Expedition against *Nineveh*. But *Cyaxares* (84) having given his Daughter *Aroites* or *Amyites* (as *Scaliger's* Copy of *Syncellus* had it) in Marriage to *Nabuchadnezzar* the Son of *Nabopolassar*, they entered into a close Alliance : and *Nabopolassar* with an Army of *Babylonians* assisted *Cyaxares* against *Sarac* or *Sardanapalus* : and they besieged *Nineveh* with their joined Forces. *Sarac* or *Sardanapalus* being terrified (85), sent away his three

Ant. Jud. lib. v. c. 1. p. 277. See the Notes there. This is fully proved in *Cellarius*, Geog. Antiq. Tom. ii. p. 436, etc. See *Plin*, Hist. Nat. lib. v. c. 18. *Ptol.* Geog. lib. v. p. 139. *Steph.* voce *Σκυθόπολις*. *Euseb.* Onomastic. voc. *Betbjan*.

(83) *Herodotus* calls it the Temple of the celestial *Venus*, lib. i. c. 105. This was the *Astarte* (*Juno* and the Moon) worshiped all over *Syria* and *Phœnicia*, and amongst the *Assyrians*, whose *Juno* she was. And that she had a Temple at *Ascalon* *Pausanias* tells us. Πρώτοις ἡ ἀνθρώπων Ἀσσυρίοις καὶ ἐν σέδεσσι τὴν ἑρμῖαν (Ἀφροδίτην) μὲν ἡ Ἀσσυρία, Κυπρίων Παφίους, ἢ Φοινίκων τοῖς Ἀσκάλωνα ἔχουσιν ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ : ὡς δὲ ἡ Φοινίκων Κυθήριοι μαθόντες σέεχσιν. Attic. p. 14. The Temple of *Ascalon* was esteemed the most ancient of any belonging to this Goddess. *Herodot.* ibid.

(84) *Alexander Polyhistor* in *Syncel.* Chronograph. p. 210, where he calls the last *Assyrian* King *Sarac*. But by Mistake *Syncellus* has *Astyages* instead of *Cyaxares*, who *Herodotus* assures us was the King who destroyed *Nineveh* and the *Assyrian* Empire, Lib. i. c. 106. and whom *Alexander Polyhistor* called *Astibares* : therefore *Astyages* is a corrupt Reading in *Syncellus* for *Astibares*, of which the Editor ought to have taken notice. See *Euseb.* Præp. Ev. lib. ix. 39. Ctes. apud *Diod. Sic.* lib. ii. p. 147. *West.* *Nic. Damascen.* apud *Excerpt.* *Valesii*, p. 438.

(85) Ctes. ap. *Diod. Sic.* lib. ii. p. 140, 141. *West.*

Sons and two Daughters with a great Treasure to *Cotta*. Prefect of *Papblagonia*, who was his Friend; and afterward, during the Siege, which continued above two Years, that he might not fall into the Hands of his Enemies, he shut himself up in his Palace with his Concubines and setting it on Fire there burnt himself and them together. The *Medes* and *Babylonians* having taken *Nineveh* destroyed it, and thereby put an End to the *Assyrian* Empire. *Cyaxares* carried all the Treasure he found in the City to *Ecbatana*; and became Master of all the *Assyrian* Dominions, except *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa*, and what belonged to them in *Mesopotamia*, *Syria*, and *Phœnicia*, which *Nabopolassar* took Possession of; and henceforth the *Babylonian* Kingdom became a distinct and independent Empire.

Herodotus ascribes the Destruction of *Nineveh* and the *Assyrian* Empire (as the *Greeks* (86) generally do) to *Cyaxares* and the *Medes*, without any Mention of the *Babylonians* assisting in it. But *Herodotus* saying that the *Medes* (87) possessed all the *Assyrian* Empire except the Dominions belonging to the Kingdom of *Babylon*, is an Intimation that the *Babylonians* assisted in the Destruction of it: and *Herodotus* had probably given some Account of it in some other of his Writings which he says he intended to publish. *Ctesias* related that the *Babylonians* both promoted and assisted in the Conquest of *Nineveh*; though he mistook the Time of it: and it appears from the Book of *Tobit*, ch. xiv. 15. that it was taken and destroyed by the *Medes* and *Babylonians* under *Nabuchodonosor* or *Nabopolassar*, whom *Berosus* also called *Nabuchodonosor*; and *Cyaxares*, whom he calls (88) *Assuerus*, as he is also called by the Prophet *Daniel*, ch. ix. 1.

(86) So *Strab.* *Geog.* lib. xvi. init. *Athenæi Deipnosoph.* lib. xii. p. 529. from *Duris*. *Pomp. Trog. Prolog.* lib. i. and *Justin* from him, lib. i. c. 3. and *Velleius Paterculus Hist. Rom.* lib. i. c. 6. p. 23. And *Eusebius* in *Chron.* who ascribes it rightly to *Cyaxares*. But *Jerome* ascribes it to *Astyages* from *Herodotus*, *Prolog.* in *Comment.* in *Prophet. Jon.* which is an evident Error; but probably of his Transcriber only.

(87) Μῆδοι — τὴν τε Νῖνον ἔλουν (ὡς ἢ ἔλουν ἐν ἑτέροις λόγοις δηλώσω) καὶ τὰς Ἀσσυρίους ὑπὸ χειρὸς ἐποίησαντο, πλὴν τῆς Βαβυλωνίης μοίρης. lib. i. c. 106.

(88) *Assuerus* or *Achsuerus*, *Axares*, *Cy-axares*, i. e. *Lord Áxares* are all the same. He is called by *Ctesias Astibaras*, and by *Alex. Polyhist.* in *Eusebius*

Eusebius

Eusebius in his *Chronicon* placed the taking of *Nineveh* by *Cyaxares* in the twenty-fourth Year of his Reign, to which his Number 1410 is fixed, which answers to the Year before *Christ* 606, which is by my Reckoning the twentieth Year of the Reign of *Cyaxares*: and this I take to be the true Year of that memorable Event. It may be ascertained within a Year or two from Scripture and the *Ptolemaic* Canon. It is said 2 *Kings* xxiii. 29. that *Pharaoh Necho King of Egypt* went up against the King of *Assyria* to the River *Euphrates* (to fight against *Carchemish*, 2 *Chron.* xxxv. 20.) *Josiah* apprehending he intended to invade *Judaea* marched out with an Army to oppose him. They met and fought in the Valley of (89) *Megiddo*, where *Josiah* was slain.

feb. *Præp. Evang.* lib. ix. c. 39. and by *Nicol. Damascen.* Excerpt. *Vales.* p. 438.

(89) *Josephus* in his present Copies (*Antiq. Jud.* lib. x. c. 5.) has it *Mendes* (Μένδης) but he probably wrote *Megdes* (Μέγδης) reading the *Hebrew* (מגדו) *Megdo*, which we read *Megiddo*. So Μένδης seems an Error of the Transcriber. *Herodotus* relates this fatal Battle between *Necho* and *Josiah*. Σύροις (i. e. *Palestine* Syrians or *Jews*, as he calls them lib. iii. c. 5.) περὶ ὃ Νεκὸς συμβαλὼν ἐν Μυγδόλῳ ἐώκησε· καὶ ἡ τὴν μάχην Καδύτιν πόλιν τῆς Συρίας εἶσαι μεγάλην εἶλε, lib. ii. c. 159. And *Herodotus* calls *Cadytis* a City of *Palestine* Syria, lib. iii. c. 5. *Herodotus* thought the Battle between *Necho* and *Josiah* was fought at *Magdolum* or *Migdol* upon the Borders of *Egypt*; and so, according to him, the City *Cadytis* was *Kadesb Barnea* in the Wilderness of *Paran*, which lay in the Road from *Magdolum* to the *Euphrates*. And those learned Men who supposed *Cadytis* to be *Jerusalem* seem to be mistaken. See *Reland.* voc. *Cadytis*, *Palæst.* tom. ii. lib. iii. p. 669. *Usser.* *Annal. Vet. Test.* ad Ann. ante Chr. 610. *Cellar.* *Geogr. Antiq.* tom. ii. lib. iii. p. 456, 457. *Perizon.* *Orig. Ægypt.* c. 23. p. 417, etc. *Prideaux* *Connect. of the Hist. of the Old and New Test.* Part i. B. i. p. 80, 81. *Hyde's* *Not. ad Peritfol. itiner. mundi*, p. 19. *Jameson's* *Spicileg. Antiq. Ægypt.* c. 2. p. 25. etc. *Herodotus* is mistaken in making *Magdolum* on the Borders of *Egypt* to be the Place where *Josiah* was killed in Battle with *Pharaoh Necho*; and which Place is called in Scripture *Megiddo*. This was a City in the Tribe of *Manasses* on this Side *Jordan*, mentioned *Josb.* xvii. 11. *Judg.* i. 27. nigh it was the Town of *Hadad-Rimmon*, afterward called *Maximianopolis*, as *Jerome* tells us *Comment. in Zech.* c. xii. 11. And therefore the Lamentation for the Death of *Josiah* is called the Lamentation of *Hadad-Rimmon in the Valley of Megiddo*. See *Magedo* in *Euseb. Onomastic.* p. 107. and *Notes*, and *Reland* *Palæst.* Tom. ii. lib. 3. p. 893, 894.

From

From this Account it appears that there was a King of *Assyria* in the Year before *Christ* 608, when *Josiah* died: therefore *Nineveh* was not then taken. But yet it must be taken in the Interval between that Year and the Year before *Christ* 604; because *Nabopolassar* the Father of *Nabuchadnezzar* assisted in the Expedition against *Nineveh*; and it appears from the *Ptolemaic Canon* that he died in the Year before *Christ* 604.

It is therefore most probable that *Eusebius* has fixed the true Year of the taking of *Nineveh*. It is also probable that *Pharaoh Necho*, hearing that the *Babylonian* and *Median* Armies were engaged in the Siege of *Nineveh*, took the Opportunity to march an Army to *Euphrates* to fight against *Carchemish* (or *Circatium* called *Mabog* in the *Syriac Version*) which belonged to the King of *Assyria*, as appears from *Isaiab* x. 9. And this might be the Reason that he took it in so short a Time; and also conquered both (90) *Syria* and *Palestine*. For in about three Months Time he had taken *Carchemish*, and subdued *Syria*; and in his Return sent for *Jeboabaz* the new King of *Judah*, who had reigned but *three Months* after the Death of his Father *Josiah*, to *Riblah* in *Hamath* or *Syria*; and deposed him and put him in Chains and carried him to *Egypt*; and laid upon the Land of *Judah* a *Tribute of an hundred Talents of Silver and a Talent of Gold*, 2 Kings xxiii. 31, 33. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 2, 3. and made *Eliakim* his elder Brother King in his stead: and changed his Name to *Jeboiakim*, to shew that he was his Vassal, *Y* 4.

These sudden and great Conquests without Opposition from either the *Assyrians* or *Babylonians* could be owing to nothing so probably as the *Babylonians* being engaged with the *Medes* against the *Assyrians*: for we find that soon after, when the *Babylonians* were at Liberty and their Kingdom settled, they immediately recovered from the King of *Egypt* all his Conquests in *Syria* and *Palestine*, and confined him to his own Kingdom, 2 Kings xxiv. 7. If the Siege of *Nineveh* was just begun when *Pharaoh Necho* invaded the Territory of the *Assyrians* in *Babylonia*; and if, as *Ctesias* related, it was taken in the third Year of

(90) Joseph. Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 6.

the Siege; then it was in the Year (91) before *Christ* 606, the Year where *Eusebius* has placed it. Hence it appears to be a very great Mis-

(91) The Time of *Nineveh* being taken may be nearly known from the History of *Tobit*. He was fifty-eight Years old when he lost his Sight, ch. xiv. 2. in the first Year of the Reign of *Asar-Haddon* and the Year before *Christ* 711: and he lived an hundred Years after to the Year before *Christ* 611, ch. xiv. 11. and *Nineveh* was not then destroyed; for *Tobit* died at *Nineveh* and was buried there, § 10, 11. His Wife *Anna* died about the same Time, and was buried with her Husband: and then *Tobias*, according to his Father's Advice, who foresaw the Destruction of *Nineveh* was near, § 4. went from *Nineveh* to *Ecbatana*, and lived there with his Wife and Children, § 12. So *Nineveh* was not besieged in the Year before *Christ* 611, and therefore, if it was taken in the third Year after it was besieged by the *Medes* and *Babylonians*, it could not be taken by this Account above two Years before the Year before *Christ* 606. It also appears from the History of *Tobit*, that he was forty-eight Years old when he was carried Captive to *Nineveh* in the Reign of *Salmanasar* in the Year before *Christ* 721, and his Son *Tobias* was about twelve Years old at that Time; for he lived to the Age of a hundred and twenty-seven Years; and before his Death heard that *Nineveh* was destroyed, ch. xiv. 15. There is no Pretence to suppose with the learned *Vignoles*, Chronol. Vol. ii. p. 441, etc. that *Nineveh* was taken in the ninth Year of *Nabuchadnezzar* and in the Year before *Christ* 596. Had *Nabuchadnezzar* in Conjunction with the *Medes* destroyed *Nineveh* and the *Assyrian* Empire, it is highly probable that the Sacred History would have taken notice of it: and that it would have been recorded amongst the memorable Exploits and Conquests of his Reign, which are very particularly set down in the prophetic Writings of *Jeremiah* and *Ezekiel*. But it is very remarkable, that the Prophet *Jeremiah* in foretelling all the Nations which were to be subdued by *Nabuchadnezzar*, ch. xxv. from the 18th to the 25th verse, makes no mention of *Assur*, *Assyria*, or *Nineveh*: Of this no Reason can be given so probable as that this City and Empire were then destroyed when the Prophecy was delivered in the fourth Year of *Jeboiakim* and the first of *Nabuchadnezzar*, in the Year before *Christ* 604. *Nineveh* was now undoubtedly destroyed, and in the Reign of *Nabopolassar* the Father of *Nabuchadnezzar*. *Vignoles's* Opinion is founded on the Supposition that *Nineveh* could not be taken by the *Medes* whilst the *Scythians* were possessed of the *Upper Asia*; who were not driven out by *Cyaxares* till the Year before *Christ* 597, as he reckons, or more truly 596, after they had reigned in the Provinces of the *Upper Asia* twenty-eight Years from the second or third Year of *Cyaxares*. But as *Nineveh* was besieged three Years before it was taken, it could not have been taken till the Year before *Christ* 594. The *Scythians*, who ruled in the *Upper Asia* only, could not have hindered the *Median* and

take

take in the learned (92) Archbishop *Usher* to place the Destruction of *Nineveh* so high as the Year before *Christ* 626, especially, when he himself allows there was a King of *Assyria* in the Year before *Christ* 610, where he, by an Error of two Years, places the Battle between *Pharaoh Necho* and King *Josiah*. And he, by another Mistake, makes *Nabopolassar* to be this King of *Assyria*: whereas it is certain that *Nabopolassar* was not King of *Assyria*; but only of *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa*, and the Countries belonging to them on this Side of *Euphrates*; but the *Medes* (after the Destruction of *Nineveh*) possessed all that which anciently and properly was the *Assyrian* Empire. And *Nabopolassar* at this Time was only Vice-Roy of *Babylonia* and subject to the King of *Assyria*. It is observable that the Scripture always distinguisheth the King of *Babylon* from the King of *Assyria*: this appears from *Jer.* i. 17, 18. And as it styles *Merodach Baladon* King of *Babylon*, not of *Assyria*, because he ruled over the *Babylonian* Kingdom only, *2 Kings* xx. 12. *Isai.* xxxix. 1. so after the *Assyrian* Empire was destroyed by the taking of *Nineveh*, and whilst *Babylon* was a distinct Kingdom, we read no more of a King of *Assyria*: and *Nabuchadnezzar* who succeeded his Father *Nabopolassar* in the *Babylonian* Kingdom, is always called either the King of *Babylon* or of the *Chaldæans*, as being King both of *Babylonia* and *Chaldæa*. And this Distinction continued whilst the *Babylonian* Kingdom was separated from the *Assyrian*, and was a di-

Babylonian Armies from taking *Nineveh*, if they had been disposed to have opposed them; the *Medes* being grown far more powerful than when the *Scythians* first invaded their Empire; and having also the Assistance of the *Babylonians*. The *Scythians* were at Peace with the *Medes*, and had no Concern with the *Assyrians*: nor do we find that they gave the *Medes* any Trouble or Terror after they had gained Settlements in the *Upper Asia*. And it is observable that the Prophet *Ezekiel* enumerating in Order the Nations which were then subdued by the *Medes* and *Babylonians*, ch. xxxii. mentions *Asshur* as being *fallen by the Sword*, *vs.* 22. before *Meshech* and *Tubal*, who were, I think, the Northern Nations or *Scythians* who were driven out of *Asia* by *Cyaxares* with a great Slaughter, *vs.* 26. and perhaps other Northern Nations who were then conquered.

(92) *Annal. Vet. Test. ad Ann. ante Chr. 626 et 610.* Dr. *Prideaux* by a less Mistake than that of *Usher* placeth the Destruction of *Nineveh* in the Year before *Christ* 612. *Connect. Book i. p. 67.*

distinct independent Kingdom: though afterwards, when the *Babylonian* Kingdom as well as the other Part of the *Assyrian* Empire which was subject to the *Medes*, with the *Median* Kingdom also, was all united again in the *Persian* Empire; then the King of *Persia* was sometimes called the King of *Assyria*, as in *Esr.* vi. 22 (93).

In the Destruction of *Nineveh* and Overthrow of the *Assyrian* Kingdom the Prophecy of *Nabum* was fulfilled, who foretold the Destruction of *Nineveh* in the Reign (94) of *Jotham* King of *Judah*, about the Year before *Christ* 750, and also of *Zephaniab*, who prophesied of its Destruction in the Reign of *Josiah*, about the Year before *Christ* 630: *Nabum* saies; *Nineveh* is of old like a Pool of Water: yet they shall flee away; stand, stand, (shall they cry) but none shall look back. Take ye the Spoil of Silver, take the Spoil of Gold: for there is none End of the Store and Glory out of all the pleasant Furniture. She is (95) empty and void and waste: and the Heart melteth, and the Knees finite together, and much Pain is in all Loins, and the Faces of them all gather Blackness, ch. ii. 8, 9, 10. *Zephaniab's* Prophecy is; He will stretch out his Hand against the North, and destroy *Assyria*, and will make *Nineveh* a Desolation and dry like a Wilderness. And Flocks shall lie down in the midst of her, and every Kind of Beast: both the Cormorant and Bittern shall lodge in the upper Lintels of it: their Voice shall sing

(93) The ancient *Greek* Writers were not so exact as the Scriptures are in the Distinction of *Assyria* and *Babylonia*: but after *Nineveh* was destroyed they reckoned *Babylon* the Metropolis of *Assyria*; and called the King of *Babylon* King of *Assyria*. So *Herodotus*, lib. i. c. 188, and in another Place he calls him King of *Babylon*, c. 77. And *Xenophon* constantly calls the King of *Babylon* King of the *Assyrians*, *Institut. Cyr.* And *Strabo* saies that *Assyria* was called *Babylonia*; Τῇ Περσίδι ἔτι τῇ Συριανῇ συναπλήρυσιν οἱ Ασσύριοι· καλῶσι δὲ ἔτι τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν, etc. *Geog.* lib. xvi. init. *Pliny* saies the same: Reliqua Pars Mesopotamiæ Assyriæque Babylonia appellata est, *Nat. Hist.* lib. vi. c. 26.

(94) *Joseph.* *Antiq. Jud.* lib. ix. c. 11.

(95) *Nineveh* was so totally destroyed, that *Lucian* saies no Footsteps of it remained; nor can it be known where it stood; Ἡ Νῆος μὲν ἀπώλωλεν ἤδη, καὶ οὐδὲν ἔχοντι εἶτι λείπεται αὐτῆς· οὐδ' αὖν εἴπῃς ὅπου ποτ' ἦν. In ἐπισκοπ. See *Bochart's Phaleg.* lib. iv. c. 20.

in the Windows, Desolation shall be in the Thresholds: for he shall uncover the Cedar Work. This is the rejoicing City that dwelt carelessly, that said in her Heart; I am, and there is none beside me: how is she become a Desolation, a Place for Beasts to lye down in! every one that passeth by her, shall hiss and wag his Hand, ch. ii. 13, 14, 15.

Now the Kingdoms of the *Medes* and *Babylonians* became two great independent Empires, which Marriage had allied together: for *Nabopolassar* had married his Son *Nabuchadnezzar* to the Daughter of *Cyaxares*. Our great Chronologer (96) Archbishop *Usher*, who is followed by Dr. *Prideaux*, from a mistaken Passage of *Alexander Polyhistor* in *Syncellus* supposes *Nabuchadnezzar* to have married the Daughter of *Astyages* Son of *Cyaxares*; which could not be: for *Astyages* was at that Time too young himself to be married, being no more than nine or ten Years of Age; and was not married till the Conclusion of the *Lydian* War, as we are told by (97) *Herodotus*. Therefore as *Nabuchadnezzar* is said to have married a *Mede*, both by (98) *Berosus* and *Alexander Polyhistor* and others; it must be the Daughter of *Cyaxares*, who in Conjunction with *Nabuchadnezzar's* Father *Nabopolassar*, took and destroyed *Nineveh*; and thereby put an End to the *Assyrian* Empire; and also afterward assisted him in his Wars to enlarge the *Babylonian* Kingdom.

The Year before *Christ* 606 being the Commencement, or Epoch of the *Babylonian* Empire, which was destroyed by *Cyrus* (as will be

(96) *Annal. Vet. Test. ad Ann. ante ær. Christ. 626.* The Error arose from not observing that *Syncellus* wrote from *Alex. Polyhistor* *Ἀστιάγην* (*Astyages*) for *Ἀσιτιάγην* (*Astibares* or *Astibaras*) by which latter Name *Alexander Polyhistor* called *Cyaxares*, as appears from *Euseb. Præp. Ev. lib. ix. c. 39.* See *Syncel. p. 210.* See above Not. 84. See *Prideaux Connect. B. i. p. 67. Edit. 8º.*

(97) *Lib. i. c. 74.*

(98) *Apud Joseph. Hist. Jud. lib. x. c. 11.* This *Median* Lady was the *Nitocris* of *Herodotus*, *lib. i. c. 184, 185.* She is called a *Mede* by *Philostrophus*, *vit. Apollon. lib. i. c. 25.* who speaks of some of her famous Works about *Babylon*. She took Care of the *Babylonian* Empire during the seven Years Distraction of her Husband *Nabuchadnezzar*. For *Josephus* observes that during his Madness the next Heir durst not meddle with it; nor any of the Nobles take the Administration of it, *Ant. Jud. lib. x. c. 10.*

shewn) in the Year before *Christ* 536, this Empire lasted just 70 Years. And this gives great Light to the Prophecy of *Isaiab*, ch. xxiii. 15, viz. *And it shall come to pass in that Day, that Tyre shall be forgotten seventy Years, according to the Days [or Time, as the Greek Version has it] of one King, i. e. of one Kingdom; which is the prophetic Dialect, as is well known. And it is very probable that the Prophet intended to represent the 70 Years Desolation of insular Tyre by the 70 Years Continuance of the Babylonian Kingdom; because Nabuchadnezzar, the principal King of Babylon, was to destroy old Tyre, which was the Metropolis and Seat of the Tyrian Kingdom: and therefore the Representation of Tyre being forgotten or desolate, by the Term of the Duration of this Kingdom was very natural as well as beautiful.*

Fifteen Years after the Destruction of *Nineveh*, the *Lydian War* began between *Cyaxares* and *Halyattes* the Father of *Cræsus*. “ Some
 “ *Scythians* who had fled for Refuge to *Cyaxares*, and to whom he had
 “ committed the Care of the noble *Median* Youths to instruct them in
 “ their Language and the Use of the Bow, having been severely cha-
 “ stised by him for coming from hunting without the Game which
 “ they had used to bring, out of Revenge slew one of their Pupils, and
 “ dressed his Flesh like Venison, and set it before *Cyaxares* who tasted
 “ of it. As soon as they had done this they fled out of the Kingdom
 “ to *Halyattes* King of *Lydia*, who took them under his Protection,
 “ and refused to deliver them up to *Cyaxares* who sent to demand them.
 “ Upon this a War commenced between the *Medes* and *Lydians*,
 “ which continued for five Years with various Success: sometimes the
 “ *Medes* and sometimes the *Lydians* getting the better. But in the sixth
 “ Year, when both Armies were engaged and had fought a long Time
 “ with equal Success, there happened a great (99) Eclipse of the Sun,

(99) Chronologers have been greatly puzzled about fixing the Time of this remarkable Eclipse, which put an End to the *Lydian War*. *Eusebius* in his *Chronicon* followed *Cicero*, and those Writers who placed it in the Reign of *Aßyages*, but differed in the Year. He placeth the Battle when the Eclipse happened, in the 3^d Year of the 48th Olympiad, or the Year before *Christ* 586. In this Year *Ricciolus* placeth it, and on the 28th Day of
 “ which

“ which had been foretold by *Thales* to the *Ionians*. The Day which
 “ was bright and clear being of a sudden darkened, so surprized both the

May about Six of the Clock in the Afternoon, and it was about eleven Digits, or twelve, as some Astronomers found it. *Kepler* and *Scaliger* follow this Account. See *Scaliger's* Animadversions on the Chronicon of *Eusebius*, p. 89. *Scaliger* placeth it in the Year before *Christ* 583. Not. in Fragn. p. 14. fin. lib. de Emendat. Tempor. But the Eclipse undoubtedly happened in the Reign of *Cyaxares* the Father of *Astyages*, as *Herodotus* assures us, lib. i. c. 74 and 103. And *Eudemus*, who flourished about the Time of the *Peloponnesian* War, related the same in his Astrological History. Θάλλω δὲ Εὐδημος ἐν ταῖς ἀστρολογικαῖς ἰσορίαις τὴν γενομένην ἑκλειψιν τῆς ἡλίου προειπεῖν Φησι, καθ' ἧς χρόνος σωῆσαν μάχην πρὸς ἀλλήλους Μῆδοί τε καὶ Λυδοί, βασιλεύοντος Κυαζάρου μὲν τῆς Αἰσάγους πατρὸς, Μήδων. Αλυάτις δὲ τῆς Κροίσου, Λυδῶν· σωᾶσθαι δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ Ἡρόδοτος ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ. Apud Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. i. p. 353, 354. *Calvitius* placeth the Eclipse in the 4th Year of the 43^d Olympiad, i. e. in the Year before *Christ* 605. And Archbishop *Usher* in the Year before *Christ* 601, or the 147th Year of *Nabonasar*; and on the 20th Day of *September*, when nine Digits of the Sun were eclipsed. This he collects by Calculation from the Lunifolar Tables of *Ptolemy* or *Hipparchus*. But *Petavius*, after a laborious Examination, found by Calculation that in the 4th Year of the 45th Olympiad, in the Year before *Christ* 597, on the 9th Day of *July*, there happened a great solar Eclipse in the lesser *Asia*, near the River *Halys*, where he thinks the Battle was probably fought between the *Medes* and *Lydians*: the Sun was eclipsed about nine Digits and twenty-two Minutes. See *Petav. Doct. tempor. lib. x. c. 1. p. 155.* *Petavius* was sensible that his Eclipse did not answer that described by *Herodotus*, which was total, or so near it, that he saies, τὴν ἡμέρην ἐξαπίνης νύκτα γενέσθαι, *The Day was suddenly turned to Night*; which does not agree to an Eclipse of little more than nine Digits, under which the Sun would cast a glaring Light. Therefore *Petavius* is forced to suppose a Cloud to come at the Instant, and to cover the enlightened Part, that the whole might be darkened. So this could not be the Eclipse mentioned by *Herodotus*: and had *Petavius* known the true Commencement of the Reign of *Astyages*, which was in the Year before *Christ* 585 at highest, as I have shewn, he would probably have concluded the Eclipse which happened in the 3^d Year of the 48th Olympiad, and in the Year before *Christ* 586, which was the last Year of *Cyaxares*, to have been that of *Thales* related by *Herodotus*. *Petavius* by Calculation found it to be about eleven Digits, and so, nearly total: but he rejected it because he thought it happened in the Reign of *Astyages*, and not of *Cyaxares*, in which latter Reign *Herodotus* rightly placed it. See *Petav. Sup. p. 154.* The learned Mr. *Costard*, Fellow of *Wadham* College in *Oxford*, has found a total Eclipse of the Sun to have happened in the Year before *Christ* 603. The

“ Armies

“ Armies that they desisted from fighting, thinking the Gods were
 “ angry with them. And by the Mediation of *Syennefis* King of *Cili-*

Shadow of which passed over the Kingdom of *Barca*, crossed the *Mediterranean* between *Candia* and *Cyprus*, then went over *Antiochetta* and *Erzroum*, and a little to the South of *Kars*. If this was the Eclipse which put an End to the *Lydian* War, the last Battle when it happened was probably fought in the Country between *Cilicia* and *Armenia*. Either of these Eclipses agree to the Account of *Herodotus*. *Bunting* found the Eclipse in the Year before *Christ* 586, ending to be eleven Digits and an half. *Petav.* eleven Digits and a third: but *Lansberg*, an Astronomer by Profession, assures us, that it was twelve Digits and twenty Minutes. *Strauchius* saies, it was twelve Digits and fifty-six Minutes. The Sun being then in its Apogee, or at the greatest Distance, and the Moon in its Perigee, the Eclipse was total for several Minutes. The Eclipse of the Year before *Christ* 603 agrees best to *Cyrus*, being Grandson of *Astyages* by the Daughter of *Halyattes*, whom he married: but it agrees not so well to the Age of *Astyages*, who was then but twelve or thirteen Years old: therefore let us see whether *Cyrus* might not be Grandson of *Astyages*, on Supposition that the Eclipse of the Year before *Christ* 586, was that which put an End to the *Lydian* War when he was married. *Astyages* was sixty-two Years old (as the Prophet *Daniel* tells us, who calls him *Darius the Mede*, c. v. 31. as will be fully proved) at the Death of *Belshazzar*, in the Year before *Christ* 553: so he was born in the Year before *Christ* 615. *Cyrus* reigned in *Persia* in the Year before *Christ* 557, and might be born of *Mandane* the Daughter of *Astyages*, in the Year before *Christ* 571, when she was fourteen Years of Age. And by this Reckoning he was twenty-one Years old in the Year before *Christ* 550, when he persuaded the *Persians* to revolt and dethroned *Astyages*. And this agrees to the Relation of *Herodotus*, who saies, he was then just come of Age, or to Manhood, *Κύρου δὲ αἰδέσθαι μὲναι*, &c. lib. i. c. 123. So that the Eclipse of the Year before *Christ* 586, agrees very well to the Age of *Cyrus* and his being the Grandson of *Astyages*, and is most probably the Eclipse predicted by *Tales*. And this Eclipse helps to reconcile to *Herodotus* the ancient Authors, as *Cicero*, etc. who placed the Eclipse in the Reign of *Astyages*. For *Astyages* reigning soon after upon the Death of *Cyaxares*, it was easy to mistake, and place this memorable Event in his Reign. But *Pliny* did not mention *Astyages*, but only saies the Eclipse happened in the Reign of *Alyattes*, in the 4th Year of the 48th Olympiad, *Nat. Hist.* lib. ii. c. 12. Edit. Ha d. Further, this Eclipse demonstrates, that *Cyaxares* reigned to the Year before *Christ* 586, which was the last Year of his Reign by my Calculation above given, and greatly confirms it. The *Lydian* War commencing in the Year before *Christ* 591, which was five Years after the Expulsion of the *Scythians*, affords a Reason of the *Scythian* Fugitives flying for Refuge to *Cyaxares*, who took them under his Protection; and afterward, for their

“*cia*, and *Labynetus* King of *Babylon*, a Peace was immediately concluded between the two Nations, and ratified by the Marriage of *Astyages* the Son of *Cyaxares* with *Ariemis* the Daughter of *Halyattes* (1).”

But before the *Lydian* War commenced, *Cyaxares* drove the (2) *Scythians* out of the upper *Asia*, where they had domineered for 28 Years, having first slain many of their Chiefs when they were drunk at a Banquet, to which he had invited them. After their Expulsion he seized upon the Provinces which had been subject to him before the *Scythians* invaded his Kingdom.

This Expulsion of the *Scythians* was in the Year before *Christ* 596. But the Expulsion of the *Scythians* seems to have been the Occasion of a War between the *Medes* and *Scythian Sacæ*. The (3) *Parthians*, from whose Country the *Scythians* were expelled, out of Hatred to the

flying from him to *Halyattes* for an Act of Cruelty committed on one of the noble *Median* Youths. Had the *Scythians* been now powerful in the upper *Asia*, they would naturally have fled to them who were their Countrymen, and would have protected them against *Cyaxares*. So that it is highly probable that the *Lydian* War commenced after the Expulsion of the *Scythians*; and then the Eclipse predicted by *Thales* and related by *Herodotus*, could be no other than that in the Year before *Christ* 586. See the Chronology of *Alphonse Des-Vignoles*, tom. ii. lib. iv. c. 5. p. 245—261. who by this Eclipse has brought the Reign of *Cyaxares* to the true Time, or the Year before *Christ* 585, where I had placed it from historical Evidence also. But *Vignoles* has placed the Epoch of *Arbaces* many Years too high, p. 261.

(1) *Herodot.* lib. i. c. 73, 74.

(2) *Herodotus*, lib. i. c. 106. If the *Lydian* War ended in the Year before *Christ* 603. the *Scythians* were driven out of *Asia* six or seven Years after. But if the *Lydian* War ended in the Year before *Christ* 586, they were driven out about ten Years before the Conclusion of that War. See above, Note 99. And I am most inclined to the latter Epoch; because *Astyages* could not be more than thirteen Years old in the Year before *Christ* 603, and was too young to be then married: or if he might be married at that Age, as Eastern Princes sometimes were; yet as the *Lydian* War continued full five Years, it must by this Epoch of its ending in the Year before *Christ* 603, have begun in the Year before *Christ* 608, at which Time *Cyaxares* was employed with his Armies in the Siege of *Nineveh*; and could not well carry on the *Lydian* War at the same Time: and especially whilst the *Scythians* possessed so great a Part of his Dominions in the upper *Asia*.

(3) *Diod. Sic.* lib. ii. p. 147.

Medes (to whom they had been subject) refused to submit to them, and delivered up their Country to the *Sacæ*, who thereupon had a long (3) War with the *Medes*; in which many Battles were fought, and great Slaughters were made on both Sides. But at last they came to Terms of Peace; and the *Partians* were by Agreement again reduced into Subjection to the *Medes*; and the *Medes* and *Sacæ* were each to possess what they had before the War; and to enter into a perpetual League of Amity and Alliance with each other. This War was in the Reign of *Astibaras*, as *Diodorus Siculus* calls *Cyaxares* from *Ctesias*: and it is probable that it happened upon the Expulsion of the *Scythians* from *Partia* and other Parts of the upper *Asia*.

The Expulsion of the *Scythians* out of the upper *Asia*, when many of them were slain, seems to be intimated by the Prophet *Ezechiel*, ch. xxxii. 26. where having mentioned the Fall of the *Assyrian* Empire, ver. 22. and of *Elam*, ver. 24. he speaks of the Slaughter of the *Scythians* under the Names of *Meshech* and *Tubal*. *There is* (saies he) *Meshech, Tubal, and all her Multitude. Her Graves are round about him: all of them uncircumcised, slain by the Sword, though they caused their Terror in the Land of the Living.* This Relation of the Prophet agrees exactly to the *Scythians*, who had been a Terror to the Kingdoms of the upper *Asia* for 28 Years, as *Herodotus* tells us; and who were driven out thence with a great Slaughter by *Cyaxares*, after he had destroyed *Nineveh* and the *Assyrian* Empire; and got Possession of *Elymais*, *Susiana*, and all the Provinces of the *Assyrian* Empire beyond *Euphrates*.

Nabopolassar being settled in the *Babylonian* Kingdom, which he possessed upon the Overthrow of the *Assyrian* Empire, with all the Provinces on this Side *Euphrates*; he sent his Son *Nabuchadnezzar* with a great Army to recover from the King of *Egypt* (4) *Carchemish*, and all that he had lately conquered in *Syria* and *Phœnicia*. The King of *Egypt* marched with all Expedition to *Carchemish*; and there the two Armies

(3) Some of the Copies of *Diodorus Siculus* say this War lasted two Years, or more.

(4) It is called *Circutium* by *Ammianus Marcellinus*, lib. xxiii. c. 5. p. 360. and *Καρχημις* by *Zosimus*, Hist. lib. iii. p. 277.

met, and joining Battle *Necho* King of *Egypt* was totally routed, and a great Part of his vast Army, consisting of *Egyptians*, *Arabians*, and *Æthiopians*, and *Libyans* were slain, *Jerem.* ch. xlv. 2, 9, 10. *Nabuchadnezzar* having taken *Carchemish*, passed the *Euphrates* with his Army, and subdued all *Syria* and *Phœnicia*, and marched as far as (5) *Pelusium*: and dispossessed the King of *Egypt* of all that he had about four Years before invaded and conquered *from the River of Egypt to the River Euphrates*, 2 Kings xxiv. 7. And all *Syria*, the upper and *Cæle-Syria*, and *Phœnicia* being recovered and added again to the *Babylonian* Empire; he began to be a *golden Head*, as described by the Prophet *Daniel*, and to have Kingdoms under him.

The Defeat of *Pharaoh Necho's* Army by *Nabuchadnezzar* happened in the Spring of the Year before *Christ* 604, and in the latter End of the fourth Year of the Reign of *Jeboiakim*, as the Prophet *Jeremiah* tells us, ch. xlv. 2. and also *Josephus* [*Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 6.*]

Josephus saies, that in this War with *Pharaoh Necho* *Nabuchadnezzar* did not reduce *Judæa*: but several Parts of *Judæa* which lay in his Way from *Phœnicia* to *Egypt* were ravaged; and a great many (6) *Jews* were taken captive amongst the *Egyptians*, *Syrians*, and *Phœnicians*, and sent to *Babylon*, and afterwards distributed into Colonies and placed in several Parts of *Babylonia*. This is related by *Berosus* from the *Chaldæan* Annals: and is confirmed by the Prophet *Jeremiah*, who relates that when *Nabuchadnezzar's* Army was in *Judæa*, the *Rechabites* fled to *Jerusalem* for fear of the *Chaldæans*, ch. xxxv. 11. From this Time the seventy (7) Years Captivity of the *Jews*

(5) *Jos. Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 6, 11. cont. Apion. lib. i. p. 450, from Berosus.*

(6) Αἰχμαλωτίζοντες (Ναβουχοδονόσορος) μετ' ἑπολιῶν χρόνον τὴν τῷ πατρὶος τελευτήσαντα Ναβουχοδονόσορος, καὶ καταστρέψας τὰ κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον περιγύματα, καὶ τὴν λοιπὴν χώραν, καὶ τοὺς αἰχμαλωτίζοντες Ἰουδαίων τε καὶ Φοινίκων καὶ Σύρων καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἐθνῶν, καὶ συντάξας τοὺς τῶν φίλων μετὰ τῆς βασιλείας διωάμεως καὶ τῆς λοιπῆς ὠφελείας ἀνακομίζοντες εἰς τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν, αὐτοὺς ὁρμήσας ὀλιγοσὺς διὰ τῆς ἐρήμου παρεγένετο εἰς Βαβυλῶνα. *Apud Jos. Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 11. Cont. Apion. lib. i. ex Beros. tertio Histor. Chaldaicæ libro.*

(7) This seventy Years Captivity was not of the whole People; but it was properly

properly commenced, being begun by this Captivity of Part of the People.

Whilst *Nabuchadnezzar* was employed in the War against the King of *Egypt*, and in settling the new made Conquest of *Syria*, *Cæle-Syria*, and *Phœnicia*; News was brought him of the Death of his Father *Nabopolassar*, who died the latter End of the Year before *Christ* 604, having reigned 21 Years.

The fourth Year of *Jeboiakim* is by our modern Chronologers *Peta-vius*, *Usher*, and others, placed in the Year before *Christ* 607. And yet the Prophet *Jeremiab*, who lived at the Time, tells us expressly, that the fourth Year of *Jeboiakim* was the first Year of the Reign of *Nabuchadnezzar*, ch. xxv. 1. and accordingly the eleventh of *Jeboiakim* is the seventh of *Nabuchadnezzar*, *Jerem.* lii. 28. and the first of *Jeboiachim* Son of *Jeboiakim* is the eighth of *Nabuchadnezzar*, 2 *Kings* xxiv. 11. And the astronomical Canon of *Ptolemy* has fixed the first Year of *Nabuchadnezzar* to the Year before *Christ* 604. whence it is evident that the fourth Year of *Jeboiakim* fell in that Year. These Chronologers therefore are forced to suppose that *Nabuchadnezzar* ruled in Partnership with his Father in the Kingdom of *Babylon*, two Years and more before his Death; and that the *Jews* reckoned his Reign from this Time of his Copartnership in the *Babylonian* Empire. But there is no Evidence either from *Berosus* or *Josephus*, or the least Intimation in Scripture, that *Nabuchadnezzar* reigned in his Father's Life-time; or that the *Jews* reckoned his Reign to commence before his Father's Death: and had he been actually in Possession of the Kingdom, he needed not have left his Conquests unfinished, and made so much Haste to *Babylon* as *Berosus* saies he did, going with a few Attendants the shortest Way through the Wilderness of *Arabia*, as soon as he heard of the Death of his Father. And it is plain also from Scripture, that the *Jews* reckoned the Years of the Reign of *Nabuchadnezzar*, as the *Ba-*

the Term which the Nation of the *Jews* was to serve the Kings of *Babylon*, *Jerem.* xxv. 11. and which became subject to the *Babylonians*, from the Time of *Nabuchadnezzar's* Conquest of *Syria* and *Phœnicia*: and the greatest Part of which Term the whole Nation were Captives and their Land desolate.

bylonians

Bylonians did, viz. from the Death of his Father ; from which Time he reigned 43 Years, according to *Ptolemy's* Canon and *Berosus* : and just so many the Scripture gives him. *Nabuchadnezzar* died in the 37th Year of the Captivity of *Jeboiachin*, 2 *Kings* xxv. 27. and he had reigned seven Years when *Jeboiachin* was carried by him Captive to *Babylon*, 2 *Kings* xxiv. 11. where it is said, *the King of Babylon took him in the eighth Year of his Reign*. These added make up exactly the 43 Years of *Nabuchadnezzar's* Reign, and no more, agreeably to the astronomical Canon and *Berosus* from the *Chaldæan* Records. Hence it appears that *Josiah* the Father of *Jeboiakim* died in the Year before *Christ* 608, according to my Computation ; and that the fourth of *Jeboiakim* and the first of *Nabuchadnezzar* commenced in the Year before *Christ* 604.

The Ground of the Hypothesis which makes *Nabuchadnezzar* reign two Years in the Life-time of his Father *Nabopolassar*, is to reconcile the Years of the *Ptolemaic* Canon from the first of *Nabuchadnezzar* to the second Year of the Reign of *Cyrus*, with the Scripture Reckoning of the 70 Years Captivity of the *Jews* within that Term. For from the first of *Nabuchadnezzar* in the Year before *Christ* 604, to the second Year of *Cyrus* inclusive (when the *Jews* returned from the *Babylonian* Captivity) which by the Canon is the Year before *Christ* 536, will not be 70 Years, but only 68 Years : i. e. from the Year of *Nabonassar* 144, to the Year of *Nabonassar* 212. So that there must be an Error of two Years in the *Ptolemaic* Canon within this Term : and this will be particularly considered, when we come to the taking of *Babylon* by *Cyrus*, and the Release of the *Jews* from their Captivity.

Nabuchadnezzar, upon the News of his Father's Death, having settled his Affairs in *Syria* and *Egypt*, and left his Army and Captives to the Care of his Officers to follow him, “ returned with a small Retinue in haste to *Babylon* : and being there settled in the peaceful Possession of the *Chaldæan* Kingdom, he dispersed the Captives he had taken into several Parts of *Babylonia* : and (8) adorned the Temple

(8) See *Joseph. Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 11.* and cont. *Apion. lib. i. p. 450, 451.* *Megasthenes* in *Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ix. p. 457.* *Strab. Geog. lib.*

“ of *Belus* with the Spoils of the War ; and enlarged the City with
 “ sumptuous Buildings ; and fortified it with a triple Wall, both
 “ round the old inner City and the new outer City, which he built :
 “ and set up magnificent Gates, and built a grand new Palace adjoin-
 “ ing to the old one : and within the Palace he raised upon Pillars of
 “ Stone and Arches the so much famed pensile (or hanging) Gardens,
 “ planted with all kind of Trees to make them look like the mountain-
 “ ous Parts of *Media* ; and thereby to oblige his Queen, who was a
 “ *Mede* ; and to resemble the high Situation of her Country, which she
 “ delighted in.” These Works of *Nabuchodonosir*, or *Nabuchadnezzar*, mentioned by *Josephus* from *Berosus*, were not all done in the Beginning of his Reign, though they follow the Relation of it. It is probable that he first adorned and enriched the Temple of his God *Belus* ; and then built a new Palace and the wonderful hanging Gardens, in which he planted a Forest (as it were) of Trees, to please his beautiful young Queen : and after he had ended his Wars, and not before, he built the new City and Walls of *Babylon*. And after these he began the Banks, or Wall of Brick and Bitumen, to enclose the River and keep it within Bounds ; but it appears from *Berosus* (9) that these Walls were not quite finished when he fell into his Distraction, after which he soon died.

Nabuchadnezzar being settled in the *Babylonian* Kingdom ; in the fourth Year of his Reign and the eighth (10) Year of the Reign of *Jeboiakim*, and the Year before *Christ* 601, he came with an Army into *Judæa*, and threatened *Jeboiakim* with Destruction if he submitted not to become tributary to him. *Jeboiakim* obeyed his Commands ; and paid him the Tribute he laid upon him, for three Years, 2 Kings xxiv. 1. But in the eleventh Year of his Reign, in the Year before *Christ* 598, hearing that the King of *Egypt* was preparing to make War upon the

xvi. init. Philostrat. vit. Apollon. lib. i. c. 25. Q. Curt. lib. v. c. 5. p. 83. Herodot. lib. i. c. 178, etc. Diod. Sic. lib. ii. p. 123, 124, 125.

(9) Apud Joseph. lib. i. cont. Apion. p. 451. where he saies, that these Walls (which were raised from the Bottom of the River) were begun by *Nabuchodonosir* ; but finished by *Nabonidus* the last King of *Babylon*.

(10) Joseph. Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 6.

King

King of *Babylon*, he entered into an Alliance with him; and refused to pay Tribute to the King of *Babylon*. But he was deceived in his Hope of Aid from *Egypt*: for the King of *Egypt* durst not come out of his own Land, to make War any more upon the *Babylonians*, after he had lost the upper *Syria*, *Cæle-Syria*, and *Phœnicia*, 2 *Kings* xxiv. 7. *Nabuchadnezzar* being provoked at his Rebellion and refusing Tribute, soon after being assisted with (11) *Astibares*, *Astibaras*, or *Cyaxares* his Father in Law, who was King of *Media*; he came with a prodigious Army of *Babylonians*, *Medes*, *Syrians*, *Moabites*, and *Ammonites*, to the Number of *ten thousand Chariots*, and *one hundred and fourscore thousand Foot*, and *an hundred and twenty thousand Horse*, as *Eupolemus* related; and laid waste *Samaria*, *Galilee*, *Scythopolis* or *Bethshean*, and *Galaaditis*: and coming before *Jerusalem*, *Jeboiakim* was terrified; that he surrendered himself into the Hands of *Nabuchadnezzar*; who took him and bound him in Chains to (12) carry him to *Babylon*, 2 *Chron.* xxxvi. 6. But afterwards changed his Purpose, and slew him with many of the noble Youths of *Jerusalem*; and commanded his dead Body to be cast out of the Walls of the City, and to lie unburied, as the Prophet *Jeremiah* had foretold, ch:xxii. 18—19. and ch. xxxvi. 30. and he carried away Part of the (13) Vessels of the Temple to *Babylon*, and put them into the Temple of *Belus* there, 2 *Chron.* ch. xxxvi. 7. 1 *Esd.* ch. i. 41. He also carried away Captive of the People from *Jerusalem* *three thousand* and (14) *twenty-three*, *Jer.* ch. lii. 28. and made *Jeboiachin* the Son of *Jeboiakim* King in his

(11) *Eupolemus* in Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ix. c. 39.

(12) It is said in 1 *Esd.* ch. i. 40. that *Nabuchodonosor* the King of *Babylon* bound him with a Chain of Brass, and carried him unto *Babylon*. And so the Greek Version has it, in 2 *Chron.* xxxvi. 6. and so *Jerome* rendered the Hebrew Text, viz. vinctum catenis duxit in Babylonem. They therefore read *veholico* [וְהוֹלִיכוֹ] instead of the present Reading [לְהוֹלִיכוֹ] *Leholico*, which is followed by the Syriac Version, and seems to be the true Reading.

(13) *Eupolemus* saies, that the *Babylonians* took *Jeboiakim* alive and carried away the Gold, Silver, and Brass, which they found in the Temple: but that *Jeremiah* secured the Ark and the Tables of the Law which were laid up in it (compare 2 *Maccab.* ii. 5.) Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ix. c. 39. p. 454.

(14) *Josephus* calls the Captives in a round Number *three thousand*, and thinks they were of the Principal of the People; and that the Prophet *Eze-*
stead.

stead. This was in the latter End of the seventh Year, or Beginning of the eighth of *Nabuchadnezzar*, *Jerem.* ch. lii. 28. and in the twelfth Year of *Jeboiakim*.

Nabuchadnezzar had no sooner made *Jeboiachin* King instead of his Father, and entered into a League with him, but he repented of what he had done; and fearing that *Jeboiachin* would revolt from him, and take up Arms to revenge his Father's Death, he was resolved to be beforehand with him; and after *Jeboiachin* had reigned *three Months and ten Days*, 2 *Chron.* xxxvi. 9. 1 *Esd.* i. 44. and *Josephus* has the same Numbers, *Nabuchadnezzar* came up against *Jerusalem* and besieged it, 2 *Kings* xxiv. 10—11. This was in the Year before *Christ* 597, and in the *eighth* Year of the Reign of *Nabuchadnezzar*, 2 *Chron.* xxxvi. 10. 2 *Kings* xxiv. 12. 1 *Esd.* i. 45.

Jeboiachin being desirous to save the City from Destruction would not stand the Siege, but went out and delivered himself up, with his Mother, and Wives, and Servants, and chief Ministers, and Officers, into the Hands of *Nabuchadnezzar*, who carried them Captive to *Babylon*. The Number of Captives, by the Reckoning of (15) *Josephus*, was *ten thousand, eight hundred, thirty-two*. But the Text, 2 *Kings* xxiv. 14. makes them *ten thousand*, consisting of the *Nobles*, and Soldiers with their Officers, *called mighty Men of Valour*; besides the *Craftsmen and Smiths* which were *a thousand*, ver. 16. And further there were *seven thousand Men* fit for Arms made Captives also, as appears ver. 16. So that the whole Number seems to have been *eighteen thousand* (16). And so many there might well be, for the Text adds, that *none remained save the poorest Sort of the People of the Land*.

Now it was that (17) *Ezechiel*, *Daniel* and his three Brethren, with

cbiel was amongst them, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. x. c. 6. But it is more probable, that *Ezechiel* was carried Captive the next Year along with *Jeboiachin*.

(15) *Antiq. Jud.* lib. x. c. 7.

(16) The *Paschal Chronicle* makes the Number 17000, including the Artificers in the first 10,000, p. 129.

(17) This was the Opinion of *Hippolytus* in *Syncellus*, *Chronog.* p. 230. The *Paschal Chronicle* places their Captivity in the last Year of *Jeboiakim*, p. 129. But the *Oriental Chronicle*, published by *Abraham Eccbellensis*, placeth it in the 1st Year of *Jeboiachin*, p. 23.

all

all the *Princes* and noble *Youths* of *Jerusalem*, were carried away Captives along with *Jeboiachin* to *Babylon*. *Ezechiel* speaking of the Captivity of *Jeboiachin*, saies, *Behold, the King of Babylon is come to Jerusalem, and hath taken the King thereof, and the Princes thereof, and led them with him to Babylon. And hath taken of the King's Seed* [that is *Zedekiah*, whom he made King] *and made a Covenant with him, and hath taken an Oath of him*, etc. ch. xvii. 12—13. And the Prophet computes from this Captivity in the several Parts of his Prophecies. Thus he began his Prophecies *in the fifth Year of King Jeboiachin's Captivity, and in the (18) thirtieth Year* (of his Age) ch. i. 1, 2. See also ch. viii. 1. ch. xx. 1. ch. xxix. 1, 17. ch. xxxi. 1. ch. xxxiii. 21. ch. xl. 1.

Nabuchadnezzar having taken *Jerusalem*, carried away thence all the *Treasures of the Temple and of the King's Palace*, and cut in pieces all the *Vessels of Gold*, which *Solomon* had made in the Temple, as the Lord had said, 2 Kings xxiv. 13. and which was foretold to *Hezekiah* about an hundred and twelve Years before by the Prophet *Isaiah*, ch. xxxix. 6. 2 Kings xx. 17. After this he made *Mattaniah* the Uncle of *Jeboiachin* King in his stead, and changed his Name to *Zedekiah*, 2 Kings xxiv. 17. and made him swear by the Name of the Lord, not to rebel against him, or to help the (19) *Egyptians*, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 13. Ezech. xvii. 13, 14, 15. 1 Esd. i. 48.

Now the Cup of God's Fury denounced by the Prophet *Jeremiah* in the fourth Year of *Jeboiakim*, and the Year before *Christ* 604, ch. xxv. against many Nations round about *Judæa*, to be subdued by the

(18) This thirtieth Year of *Ezechiel* hath been variously understood by Chronologers. *Usher* and *Lud. Capellus* reckon it the 30th Year from the great Passover celebrated in the 18th Year of *Josiah*, Annal. Vet. Test. p. 127. Chronol. Sac. Capel. apud Walton. in Bibl. Polyglot. Appar. p. 19. But this is wholly without Foundation. Others, and amongst them *Lud. Capellus*, reckoned it the 30th Year of Jubilee placed to the 18th of *Josiah*: altogether likewise without Foundation. It was most probably the 30th Year of *Ezechiel's* Age, who was a Priest, y^e 3. and which was the Age appointed for the *Levites* to enter upon the sacred Service of the Tabernacle, Numb. iv. 3, etc.

(19) Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 7.

King of *Babylon*, and first of all against *Jerusalem* and the Cities of *Judah*, and the Kings thereof and the Princes thereof, was begun to be poured out upon them by the Armies of *Nabuchadnezzar*, in the Destruction of *Jeboiakim*, and the Captivity of his Son *Jeboiachin*; and which was to make the whole Land desolate by the Captivity of *Zedekiah*, and the burning of the City and Temple of *Jerusalem*. After that, it was to be poured out upon *Tyre* and *Zidon*, and then upon *Egypt*; and the Kings of the Land of *Uz*, and the *Philistines*, *Ashkelon*, *Azza*, (or *Gaza*) *Ekron*, *Ashdod*, *Edom*, *Moab*, *Ammon*, *Arabia*, and other Countries adjacent, and *Elam* and the Kings of the North (the *Scythians*) all these were to be subdued and made desolate by *Nabuchadnezzar* King of *Babylon*, and by the *Medes*, ver. 18—26. The *Affyrians* are not named, because their Empire was already destroyed: and after these Nations the *Medes* (who assisted the *Babylonians* in the Destruction of other Nations, and especially of *Judaea*) were also to be subdued by the *Persians*; and last of all the *Babylonians* and *Chaldeans*, called *Sbesbach* (20), were to be destroyed by the *Persians* also. All this was to happen in the Compass of seventy Years, from the fourth Year of the Reign of *Jeboiakim* to the taking of *Babylon* by *Cyrus*, *Jerem.* xxv. 1, 9, 11, 12, 15, to 27, and ver. 29. ch. xxvii. 2, 3. ch. xlv. 13, etc. and ch. xlvii, xlviii, xlix, l, li. In *Ezek.* ch. xxxii. in the twelfth Year of *Jeboiachin's* Captivity, *Elam* is mentioned as having been subdued, with the Northern Nations (the *Scythians*) called *Mesbech* and *Tubal*, with other Nations lying North of *Judaea*, probably *Armenia*, *Cappadocia*, *Parthia*, and *Bactria*,

(20) The King of *Sbesbach*, who was to drink the Cup of God's Fury the last of the Nations, *Jerem.* xxv. 26. is undoubtedly the King, i. e. the Kingdom of *Babylon*. *Sbesbach* is styl'd *Babylon* here in the *Chaldee* Paraphrase, and in ch. li. 41. and *Jerome* understands it of *Babylon*, Comment. in loc. The *Syriac* Version renders it *the Monarch*. It seems to be so called from the *Persic* Word *Schach*, i. e. *King*, or *Great Prince*. And so *Babylon* is called *Sbesbach*, as being the *Queen of Cities*, which ruled over other Cities: accordingly in *Jerem.* ch. li. 41. the *Syriac* Version renders the Word, *Reginarum maxima*, *the greatest of Queens*, meaning *Babylon* there mentioned. And the Prophet *Isaiab*, ch. xlvii. 5. calls *Babylon*, *the Lady of Kingdoms*. *Selden* is quite mistaken in his Notion of the Word. *De Dis Syr.* Syntag. ii. c. 13.

which

which were conquered by *Cyaxares*. These are represented as subdued before *Edom*, ver. 24—30. And so *Elam* and the rest belong to the Conquests of the *Medes*, and not to those of *Nabuchadnezzar*. It appears thence also that *Elam*, with *Susiana* belonging to it, *Dan*. ch. viii. 2. was subdued after *Assur*, ver. 22. by *Cyaxares*, and about the Time of the Destruction of the *Scythian* Nations, called (21) *Meshech* and *Tubal*, ver. 26. And hence it appears also that *Nineveh* was destroyed, as I have observed above, during the *Scythian* Tyranny in the upper *Asia*. The Order of the Falling or Destruction of these Nations in *Ezekiel* is very remarkable, viz. first, *Assur* (*Assyria*) then *Elam* (*Persia*) then *Meshech* and *Tubal* (Northern Nations in upper *Asia*) then *Edom* and the Kings of the adjacent Countries; then *Zidon*, [after which *Tyre* was subdued] and last of all *Egypt*, ver. 31, 32. the Fall of which last Kingdom is mentioned as future. This is the true Order of the Destruction of these Kingdoms, and is verified by the Scripture and other History concurring with it. So *Elam* (22) with *Susiana*, were probably subdued about the Year before *Christ* 596, which was ten Years after the Fall of *Assyria*. And the *Scythian* Nations were driven out of *Asia* the same Year before *Christ* 596, or the Year after; and the other Northern Nations, *Armenia*, *Cappadocia*, etc. were reduced about the same Time. *Edom* and the *Zidonians*, with other Nations who had revolted from *Nabuchadnezzar*, were miserably wasted and destroyed by his Armies after he had destroyed *Jerusalem*, in the latter End of the nineteenth Year of his Reign, and the latter End of the Year before *Christ* 586, and a little before *Ezekiel* wrote what is related in the xxxii^d Chapter of his Prophecies. For in the twelfth Year of *Jehoiachin's* Captivity, and the first Day of the twelfth Month,

(21) *Josephus* thinks, that *Meshech* are the *Cappadocians*. Μοσυχλοὶ δὲ ὑπὸ Μισύχκτιονες Καππαδόκαι μὲν ἄρτι κέκληται πόλις γὰρ ἐστὶ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τῇ νυνὶ Μάζακα, δηλῶσα—ἕτως ποτὲ προσεγορεύθεν πᾶν τὸ ἔθνος. *Antiq. Jud.* lib. i. c. 6. It is mentioned in *Ptolem. Geog.* p. 127, 203. *Strab. Geog.* lib. xiv. p. 979. where he calls *Mazaca* the Metropolis of *Cappadocia*. *Plin. Hist. Nat.* lib. vi. c. 3.

(22) It appears from *Jerem.* ch. xlix. 34. that *Elam* was not subdued in the Beginning of the Reign of *Zedekiah*, or in the Year before *Christ* 597; for in that Year *Elam* is threatened with a terrible Destruction.

which was the Beginning of the twentieth Year of *Nabuchadnezzar*, *Edom* and the *Zidomians* are mentioned as being then fallen and slain by the Sword. *Josephus* supposeth (23) these Nations to have been destroyed in the fifth Year after the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, and in the twenty-third Year of the Reign of *Nabuchadnezzar*, and just before his Invasion of *Egypt*. In which he is certainly mistaken. But there is a Difficulty about *Elam*; whether it was subject to the *Medes* or to the *Babylonians*, or which of these Nations subdued it. The Prophet *Daniel* is said to have had a Vision at *Susa*, or *Shushan*, which was the Metropolis of the Province of *Elam*, in the third Year of the Reign of King *Belsazzar*. This looks as if *Susa* and *Elam* belonged to the *Babylonian Kingdom*; and had been conquered by *Nabuchadnezzar*: and yet there is the greatest Evidence that they belonged to the *Medes*, who conquered them after they had destroyed *Nineveh* and the *Assyrian Empire*; and that *Cyrus* took them from the *Medes*; and that they were never subject to the *Babylonians*. *Æschylus*, in the Person of *Darius Son of Hystaspes*, saies, that a *Mede* was the Commander of the Army which first conquered and wasted *Susa*. And this *Mede* was *Cyaxares*; for he adds, that (24) *Cyrus* was the third from him.

Strabo (25) saies, that *Susiana* was esteemed to be a Part of *Persia*, and always followed the Fate of it, and was subject to those who were Masters of *Persia*: and that the *Elymæans* and *Susians* were the same People: and 'tis certain that *Persia* was never subject to the *Babylonians*. It appears also from (26) *Herodotus*, that *Susa* was subject to *Cyrus*, after he conquered the *Medes* and before he conquered *Babylon*: and *Elam* is joined with *Media* in the Destruction of *Babylon*, foretold by *Isaiab*, ch. xxi. 2, etc.

The only Objection to this is a Passage of (27) *Xenophon*, where he

(23) *Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 9.*

(24) Τὸ δ' αὖτε Σέσωξ ἐξεκίνησεν πρὸς αὐτόν.

—Μὴ δὲ γὰρ αὐτὸς πρῶτος ἡγεμὼν ἔρχεσθαι.

—Τεῖς δ' αὖτ' αὐτῷ Κῦρος, ἑταῖροι αὐτοῦ. *Pers. p. 161, 162. edit. Gr. Steph.*

(25) *Geog. lib. xv. p. 1058. lib. xi. p. 795.*

(26) *Lib. i. c. 188.*

(27) *Institut. Cyr. lib. v. init. lib. vi. p. 168, and p. 155. edit. Francof. 1596.*

mentions

mentions *Abradatas* King of *Susa* as an Ally to the King of *Babylon*; and who came over to *Cyrus* against him by the Persuasion of his beautiful Wife *Panthea*, whom *Cyrus* had taken Captive and restored to him without violating her Chastity. But as *Xenophon* is mistaken in several Things relating to the History of the *Babylonian* Kingdom; so this Story of *Abradatas* and *Panthea* seems to be a mere Embellishment and not a real historical Fact. Nor does it appear from *Xenophon's* Account that *Abradatas* took part with the King of *Babylon* as his Subject, but only as a Friend and voluntary Ally, as *Panthea* intimates to *Cyrus*: and *Xenophon* calling him *King of the Susians* makes the Story suspected; *Susa* having never had any King of its own, but following the Fate of *Persia* which was subject to the *Medes* both before and after the *Assyrian* Empire was destroyed. *Strabo* tells us that *Susa* is a Part of *Persia*, and that *Cyrus* made it his capital Palace, after his Conquest of *Media*. From what has been observed it appears evident that *Susiana* and *Elam* or *Elymais* was subject first to the *Assyrians* whilst they held the Empire of *Asia*; and after them, to the *Medes*; and became subject to *Cyrus*, with *Media*; and was never subject to the *Babylonians*. So that the Vision of the viiith Chapter of *Daniel* was probably in the third Year of *Darius the Mede*; in whose Reign the Prophecies of the ixth Chapter were delivered. And it appears from *Daniel* ch. v. 13, 14. that *Daniel* was never known to *Belshazzar*, or employed by him in the Affairs of his Kingdom: but he was at *Susa* about the *Business* of the King who then reigned, ch. viii. 27. And *Daniel* was well known to *Darius* and highly esteemed by him. So that I am inclined to think that the Prophecies of the seventh and eighth Chapters of *Daniel* were revealed in the Reign of *Darius the Mede*: and that the Name *Belshazzar* is an Error of an ancient Copier of them. By placing the seventh and eighth Chapters of *Daniel* in the Reign of *Belshazzar*, the Series of the Prophecies are put out of Order. For *Belshazzar's* Reign ends in the fifth Chapter, and *Darius the Mede* takes the Kingdom: and the Matters of the sixth Chapter wholly belong to his Reign. The Prophecies of the ninth Chapter were also in the Reign of *Darius the Mede*; so that it is not probable that the seventh and eighth Chapters should be-

long to the Reign of *Belsbazzar*, or to any other than the Reign of *Darius* immediately preceding and following them : and which is strangely interrupted on Supposition that these two Chapters belong to the Reign of *Belsbazzar*. Another Argument may be added, *viz.* that *Belsbazzar* did not reign one whole Year ; and was slain in the first Year of his Reign, as *Daniel* relates in the fifth Chapter. His Father *Neriglissar*, or *Nergal-Asar*, called in the *Ptolemaic* Canon *Niricassolassar*, reigned four Years before him, and was slain by *Cyrus* ; and after his Death, *Belsbazzar*, who is called by *Berosus* and the *Ptolemaic* Canon *Laborsoarchod* reigned no more than *nine Months* : whereas the Prophecies of the eighth Chapter of *Daniel* were in the *third* Year of the Reign of that King, in whose Reign they were revealed ; and therefore could not belong to the Reign of *Belsbazzar*, unless his Father *Neriglissar* reigned only in his Name, as Regent for his Son ; of which there is no Evidence. Lastly, the ancient *Paschal Chronicle* placeth the Prophecies of the seventh and eighth Chapters of *Daniel* in the *first* and *third* Year of *Darius the Mede*, who succeeded *Belsbazzar*, p. 141. And this might be the Reading of the old Vulgate *Greek* Version of the Book of *Daniel* which is lost. But to return :

Zedekiah being made King of *Judah* by *Nabuchadnezzar*, who made him swear by the Name of the God of *Israel* not to rebel against him, or to enter into an Alliance with any of his Enemies, or to join with any neighbouring Nation against him, lightly regarded his Oath : but when (28) the Kings of the *Edomites*, *Moabites*, *Ammonites*, *Tyre*

(28) The Message of these Kings to *Zedekiah*, is by a gross Error in the *Hebrew* Text said to be *in the Beginning of the Reign of Jeboiakim*, Jerem. xxvii. 1. But it is evident from ♣ 3, 12 and 20, that the Chapter relates to *Zedekiah's* Reign ; and all that the Prophet said was after the Captivity of *Jeboiachin*. And the *Syriac* Version has it rightly the Beginning of the Reign of *Zedekiah*. And this Reading is confirmed by the first Verse of the 28th Chapter ; *and it came to pass the same Year* (before-mentioned ch. xxvii.) *in the Beginning of the Reign of Zedekiah*, etc. where all the Copies have *Zedekiah*. *Jerome* observes that the *Septuagint* Version had not the first Verse of the xxviiith Chapter, Comm. in loc. And it is omitted in all the *Greek* Copies, excepting the *Complutense*, which follows the *Latin* Vulgate. In the

and

and *Sidon*, who were all jealous and afraid of the Power of the King of *Babylon*, sent *Messengers to Jerusalem*, Jerem. xxvii. 3. to propose an Alliance with him against the King of *Babylōn*; in order to shake off their Allegiance to him; and not to serve him. *Zedekiah* was inclined to join in the Confederacy. And as the *Diviners* and *Astrologers* of these Kings who had been consulted in the Affair, assured them of Success; and that they should not be subject to the King of *Babylon* any more, v. 9. so the false Prophets of *Zedekiah* gave him the same Assurance of Safety and Deliverance from the Power of the King of *Babylon*, v. 14. On this account the Prophet *Jeremiah* was commanded to send *Bonds* and *Yokes* by the Embassadors of all these Kings to their Masters, v. 2, 3. and to bid them to assure them in the Name of the Lord of Hosts the God of *Israel*, that they should not be able to resist the Power of the King of *Babylon*, unto whom God had given their Countries, v. 6. and that they and *many other Nations and great Kings should serve* (29) *him*, v. 7. as it ought to be rendered; and as the eighth Verse shews to be the Sense; where it is added, *that the Nation and Kingdom which will not serve Nabuchadnezzar King of Ba-*

xxxviiith Chapter all Copies agree that what is there related was in the *fourth* Year of *Zedekiah*. And therefore it was not in the Beginning of his Reign, but in the Beginning of the *fourth* Year of his Reign. And so the *Hebrew* Text is to be understood.

(29) The Reading in our Bible is, *And then many Nations and great Kings shall serve themselves of him*; as if it related to the Conquest of *Babylon*. The Word THEN is not in the Text; and the *Latin Vulgate*, *Targum* and *Syriac* Version have it, *Many Nations, etc. shall serve him*: and so the *Complutense Greek* Copy has it. *Jerome* observes, that the Verse was omitted in the *Septuagint* Version, Comm. in loc. But it was in *Theodore's* Copy. And the *Hebrew* Text also means, *shall serve* [בו] *Him*. The Word *Bo* [בו] signifies *Him* in the Dative Case: and should have been rendered *Him*, and not, *of him*. Thus it signifies in *Job* xiii. 9. do ye so mock *him*: where it is *Bo*. By the same Way of speaking *Bi* [בי] signifies the Dative *Mibi*. 1 Sam. xii. 3. and *Bam* [בם] *illis*, Jerem. xxxiv. 9. where likewise the Words are wrong translated: and should be rendered, *That none should serve them, who is a Jew his Brother*. See Nold. Concordant. Partic. Ebræo-Chald. p. 159. And had the *Hebrew* Verb meant in a reciprocal Sense, *shall serve themselves*, it would have been in the Conjugation *Hithpabel*, according to the *Hebrew* Idiom.

bylon,

bylon, and that will not put their Neck under the Yoke of the King of Babylon, that Nation will I punish, saith the Lord, with the Sword—till I have consumed them by his Hand. But if they submitted to serve him as his Tributaries, they should live quietly and prosperously in their own Land, *ŷ 11.* Therefore he exhorted them not to hearken to their Prophets and Diviners who told them *Lies*; but to serve the King of *Babylon*; and thereby avoid the Destruction of themselves and Desolation of their Country, *ŷ 9, 10.* *Jeremiab* delivered the same Message from God also to *Zedekiab*; and advised both him and the Priests of *Jerusalem* not to hearken to the lying Prophets, who had promised them in the Name of the Lord Deliverance from the Power of the King of *Babylon*; and pretended that in *two* Years Time his Empire would be destroyed, (meaning by the *Egyptians*, as appears from *Ezech. xvii. 15, 17.*) and that all the Vessels of the Temple, and *Jechoniab* and those who were made Captives with him should be brought back and return to *Jerusalem*: *ŷ 12—17.* and *ch. xxviii. 1, 2, 3, 4.* *Jeremiab* assured both the King and People, that the Prophets had told them nothing but *Lies*: but that if they served the King of *Babylon*, as *Zedekiab* had sworn to do, they should live in Peace, and save both the City and Temple of *Jerusalem* from Destruction and Desolation, *ŷ 12—18.*

The Words of the Prophet *Jeremiab* made an Impression upon *Zedekiab*; and he kept his Treaty with the King of *Babylon* five Years after this. But in the Beginning of the ninth Year of his Reign he brake his Covenant with *Nabuchadnezzar*, having made an Alliance with *Pharaoh Hophra* King of *Egypt*, who was to assist him with Horse and a Body of Foot against the King of *Babylon*, *Ezech. xvii. 15. 2 Kings xxiv. 20. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 12, 13.* *Nabuchadnezzar* hearing of this Alliance between *Zedekiab* and the King of *Egypt*, marched with a numerous Army into *Cæle-Syria*. And when he came to the Way which parted the Roads, one of which led to *Rabbath* the chief City of the *Ammonites*, and the other to *Jerusalem*; he made his Army halt; and used *Divinations by Arrows*, and consulted his *Teraphim*, or magical Images, and the Entrails of Beasts, whether he should first fall upon the *Ammonites*, (who had joined with the *Jews* in

in the Confederacy against him) or march directly against *Jerusalem*, Ezech. xxi. 19, 20, 21, 22. The Divination by magical Images and the Entrails of sacrificed Beasts is well known: but the Divination by *Arrows*, which was peculiar to the *Babylonians* and *Arabians*, and derived from them to other Nations, is not commonly to be met with (30). The Manner of it was by writing *Names* or *Words* upon certain *Arrows* without Heads (31) or Feathers, which were kept for the Purpose in the Temple of some Idol. The Thing divined about [whether to be done or not, or which of two Things was first to be done, the Names of which were written upon the Arrows] was wrote on one Arrow, *mandatory*; and on another *prohibitory*; and the third was blank. These were (32) mixed or shaken together, and put into a Quiver or some Vessel which was set before an Idol. They acted according to the Direction of the written Arrow which was first drawn out; whether it *commanded* or *forbad* the Thing divined about; or which of the two consulted about was first to be done. So the Divina-

(30) The learned Dr. *Pocock* gives an Account of this sort of Divination, viz. Cum esset alicui negotium magni momenti peragendum, sagittas, quas tres vasculo inclusas habebant, consulere solebant; earum uni inscriptum erat, *Jussit me Dominus meus*; alteri, *Prohibuit me Dominus meus*: tertia autem nulla nota inscripta fuit. Harum unam manu extrahenti si occurreret illa quæ juberet, alacri animo, tanquam monente Deo, ad opus pergebant; sin illa quæ vetaret, desistebant: quod si ἀγράμματ' illa, reponebant, donec prodiret quæ vel juberet vel vetaret. Specim. Hist. Arab. p. 327, 328, 329. *Jerome* also explains the Text of *Ezechiel* about this Divination, viz. Ritu gentis suæ oraculum consulit, ut mittat sagittas suas in pharetram, et commisceat eas inscriptas sive signatas nominibus singulorum, ut videat cujus sagitta exeat, et quam prius civitatem debeat oppugnare. Hanc autem Græci βελομαντίαν sive ῥαβδομαντίαν nominant. Comment. in loc. Ezech. p. 847.

(31) The *Greek* Version renders the Word translated rightly *Arrows*, by ῥαβδία, (as the *Alex.* Copy has it) *little Rods*: because they were Arrows without Heads or Feathers, as the learned Mr. *Sale* acquaints us in his preliminary Discourse on the *Koran*, p. 126, 127. This Divination was used amongst the *Arabians* till the Time of *Mohammed*, who forbad it in his *Koran*, c. v. p. 94.

(32) Our Translation saies, *He made his Arrows bright*, y 21. But *Jerome* or the *Latin Vulgate* renders the Words better, *he shook or mixed the Arrows together*.

tion here being whether *Rabbath* or *Jerusalem* should be first invaded, the Arrow for warring against *Jerusalem* came out first.

The War being by Divination determined to be made first against *Jerusalem*, *Nabuchadnezzar* marched with his Army in the right-hand Road which led into *Judæa*. This Army consisted of *Babylonians*, and all the *Chaldeans*, *Pekod* and *Shoa* and *Koa*; and all the (33) *Affyrians* with them, *Ezech.* xxiii. 22. In their Way to *Jerusalem* they took several of the fenced Cities of *Judah*: and then besieged *Jerusalem* with the main Army, and invested *Lachish* and *Azekab* at the same Time, *Jer.* xxxiv. 7. *Pharaoh Hophra* King of *Egypt*, whom the *Greeks* call *Apries*, was now very powerful. He had (34) conquered *Sidon* and other Cities of *Phœnicia*; and beat the *Phœnicians* and *Cyprians* in a Sea-Fight. These Successes made him so proud and arrogant that he not only defied all human Power, but boasted that it was not in the (35) Power of any of the Gods to deprive him of his Kingdom. He had excited *Zedekiah* to rebel against the King of *Babylon*, and promised to assist him with all his Forces; and having received Notice that *Nabuchadnezzar* had invaded *Judæa* and besieged *Jerusalem*; he immediately marched out of *Egypt* with a great Army into *Judæa*, in order to raise the Siege of *Jerusalem*, and assist *Zedekiah* against the *Babylonians*. Upon this *Nabuchadnezzar* left *Jerusa-*

(33) These *Affyrians* were the Subjects of his Brother *Astyages* King of the *Medes*, who assisted him in the War against *Zedekiah*; as his Father *Cyaxares* had before assisted him against *Jeboiakim*.

(34) *Diod. Sic. lib. i. p. 79. Herodot. lib. 2. c. 161.*

(35) Ἀπρίης ὃ λέγει εἶναι ἦτορ ἢ διάνοις, μήδ' αὖ Θεὸν μιν μηδένα δυνάσθαι παύσαι τὴν βασιλείην· ἔγω αὐτοῦ ἀσφαλῆως ἐαυτῷ ἰδρύσθαι ἐδέχεται. *Herodot. ibid. c. 169.* This is very agreeable to what the Prophet *Ezechiel* relates of his proud boasting; who represents him saying: *My River is mine own*, (that is, my Kingdom famed for the great River *Nile* which ran through it) *and I have made it for myself*, ch. xxix. 3. But God, whom he had defied, let him know by the Prophet that he was able to take his River from him, wherein, like the great *Dragon* or *Leviathan*, he sported himself, (*ibid.* See *Isai.* li. 9. *Psf.* lxxiv. 13, 14.) *and that all the Inhabitants of Egypt should know that he is the Lord*; and declares *that he would bring a Sword upon them—and that the Lord of Egypt should be desolate and waste*; and they should know that he is the Lord; because he said, *the River is mine and I have made it*, *† 6, 8, 9.*

lem,

lem, and went to attack the *Egyptian Army*, which upon his Approach retired without (36) fighting into their own Land; *Jer.* xxxvii. 5, 7. and treacherously left *Zedekiah*; and never after assisted him in the War. For this cowardly and perfidious Behaviour in deserting the *Jews* and leaving them to be destroyed by the *Babylonians*, *Ezekiel* prophesied that the *Egyptians* should fall by the Sword, and their Land should be laid waste and be desolate forty Years, ch. xxix. 6—12.

Nabuchadnezzar having driven the *Egyptians* home, returned to the Siege of *Jerusalem*, *Jer.* xxxvii. 8, 9, 10. as the Prophet assured the People that he would. The Siege continued eighteen Months, from the ninth Year of the Reign of *Zedekiah* and the seventeenth Year of *Nabuchadnezzar*, to the eleventh Year of *Zedekiah* and the nineteenth Year of *Nabuchadnezzar*: for it began in the tenth Day of the tenth Month in the ninth of *Zedekiah*; and in the ninth Day of the fourth Month in the eleventh Year of his Reign the City was taken by Storm, not being able to hold out any longer on account of the Famine which raged in it, and the Loss of Men who died by it as well as by the *Babylonian* Darts and Arrows thrown and shot from the Forts which they built round about it. The City was stormed and taken about Midnight, and the Inhabitants young and old, Men, Women and Children were put to the Sword; and many of them slain within the Temple, 1 Esdr. i. 53. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 17. *Zedekiah* with his Sons and chief Officers, and the best Part of his Army that was left, made their Escape in the Night out of the City through the Camp of the *Babylonians*, and fled for their Lives. But the Army of the *Chaldees* pursued after him and overtook him in the Plains of *Jericho*, where his Army was dispersed, and he was taken Prisoner, and carried to the

(36) *Josephus* saies there was a Battle between the two Armies in which the *Egyptians* were defeated and put to Flight, *Ant. Jud.* lib. x. c. 7. p. 523. But the Prophet *Jeremiah* saies nothing of a Battle, but only that *Pharaoh's Army* which was come to help *Zedekiah*, should return to *Egypt* into their own Land, ch. xxxvii. 7. And the Prophet *Ezekiel*, saying, the *Egyptians* had been a Staff of Reed to the House of *Israel*, ch. xxix. 6. and denouncing Desolation of their Country on that account; shews that they had been treacherous, and deserted *Hezekiah* without venturing a Battle: and so *Josephus* seems to be mistaken.

King of *Babylon*, who lay at *Riblab* in *Cæle-Syria*. There *Nabuchadnezzar*, having upbraided him with his Ingratitude, Treachery and Breach of Faith, first caused his Sons to be slain before his Eyes; and then ordered his Eyes to be put out, and commanded his Officers to bind him with Fetters of Brass and to carry him to *Babylon*, where he soon after died of Grief, as is probable. Thus *his Eyes did behold the Eyes of the King of Babylon*, according to the Prophecy of *Jeremiah*, ch. xxxii. 4. xxxiv. 3. and yet he did not see *Babylon*, though he was to die there, according to the Prophecy of *Ezekiel*, ch. xii. 13. After *Nabuchadnezzar* had slain the Sons of *Zedekiah*, and ordered his Eyes to be put out; he commanded the High Priest *Seraiah* and the second Priest *Zephaniah*, and all the *Jewish* Nobles and Officers of the Court and Army which they found in *Jerusalem*, to be slain. Those of *Zedekiah's* Army, who escaped, fled into *Egypt* and dwelt there. But *Nabuchadnezzar* was not satisfied with having taken *Jerusalem*, and made the King of *Judah* captive; but resolved utterly to demolish and lay it waste, that it might never be able any more to rebel against him or resist his Forces. Therefore about a Month after his taking the City, in the seventh Day of the fifth Month, which answered to our July and Part of August, and in the nineteenth Year of his Reign, which was in the Year before Christ 586. he sent *Nabuzaradan* Captain of his Guard with an Army of Chaldeans to *Jerusalem*, who burnt the Temple and City to the Ground; and demolished the Walls all round it; and carried away to *Babylon* all the Vessels of Brass, Silver and Gold which had been left before, and all the Treasure of the Temple and of the King's Palace, and of the Houses of the Princes, 1 *Esd.* i. 54. 2 *Chron.* xxxvi. 18. according to the Word of *Jeremiah* the Prophet, ch. xxvii. 18—22. and which *Isaiab* had long before foretold to *Hezekiah*, 2 *Kings* xx. 17, 18. and he left none remaining but the Poor of the Land to be Vine-Dressers and Husbandmen. All this is related *Jerem.* xxvii. 18—22. 2 *Kings* xxv. 1—22. 2 *Chron.* xxxvi. 13—22. *Jerem.* xxxix. 1—10. lii. 4—28. *Joseph. Jud. Antiq.* lib. x. c. 8. It is observable that *Jerusalem* was taken and burnt in a *Sabbatical* Year, as appears from *Jerem.* xxxiv. 8—18. And I have shewn in the foregoing Computations that the Year before Christ 586 was

was a Sabbatical Year. Therefore our learned modern Chronologers *Usher*, *Petavius* and others are plainly mistaken in placing the burning of the Temple and City of *Jerusalem* two or three Years higher than I have placed it.

Scaliger in his Judgment upon a Chronological Thesis at the End of his Preface to his Chronological Canons, proposes two Difficulties concerning *Zedekiah*. One is; how he comes to be called the *third Son of Josiah*, 1 Chron. iii. 15. when he was thirteen Years younger than *Jeboahaz* called there *Shallum*, as appears from *Jerem.* xxii. 11. and yet *Jeboahaz* or *Shallum* was the fourth Son of *Josiah*, compare 2 Kings xxiii. 31. with ch. xxiv. 18. *Scaliger* owns he could not solve the Difficulty; and it is hard to assign any Reason for this Order of the Names in 1 Chron. iii. 15. but by supposing it arose from a Mistake of some Copier. The other Difficulty proposed by *Scaliger* is of more Consequence. *Jeremiah* told *Zedekiah* from God, that *he should not die by the Sword; but that he should die in Peace, and* (as it follows) *with the Burnings of his Fathers the former Kings which were before him, so shall they burn him*, (so it ought to be rendered according to the Letter of the Hebrew Text, in which *Odours* is the Addition of the Translators) *Jerem.* xxxiv. 4, 5.

In this Passage what *Scaliger* reckoned a Difficulty is easily answered. The Prophet meant only that *Zedekiah* should not die or be slain in the War. His dying *in Peace* was his dying in his Bed, though in a captive State, and being buried with the *Jewish* Ceremonies, as one who died in Peace. But there is a Difficulty in the Words which *Scaliger* was not aware of: for instead of *Burnings* and *burning him*, (or *for him*) the Septuagint Version has it. *as they lamented for thy Fathers who reigned before thee, so shall they lament for thee, &c.* And this is the Reading of the Syriac and Arabic Versions. Burning of *Spices* and *Odours* over the Bodies of their Kings attended the funeral Lamentations of the *Jews*. This appears from 2 Chron. xvi. 14. and ch. xxi. 19. But as it is not probable that the *Jews* in their miserable State of Captivity could provide *Spices* and *Perfumes* to burn at the Funeral of *Zedekiah*; so it seems probable that they could do no more than make Lamentations over his dead Body, which the King of
Babylon

Babylon permitted them to bury after their own Custom. And this Lamentation seems to be mentioned to satisfy *Zedekiah*, that though he should be carried captive to *Babylon*, he should there meet with a better Fate than his Brother *Jeboiakim* had met with ; who was slain and his Body thrown out of the Walls of *Jerusalem*, and lay unburied like that of an *Ass* ; and no Lamentations made for him, Jer. xxii. 18. So that the *Septuagint* (37) and *Syriac* Reading seems to be right.

After *Nabuchadnezzar* was returned with his Army and Captives and the Spoils of *Jerusalem* and the Temple to *Babylon* (38), he dedicated the sacred Vessels to his Idols ; and settled the Captives in *Babylonia*. But he did not send any Colony from *Babylonia* into *Judæa*, as *Salmanasar* had done before into the Cities of *Samaria* : so that the Land of *Judab* lay desolate and uncultivated ; that it might enjoy its *Sabbaths* ; for so long as it lay desolate, it kept *Sabbath*, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21. At the same time the King of *Babylon* ordered the most noble and beautiful of the *Jewish* Youths, and of *Zedekiah's* Family, [some of whom were made Eunuchs, as it had been foretold 2 Kings xx. 18.] to be educated in the Manners, Language and Learning of the *Chaldeans* ; and to be maintained from his own Table. Amongst those of *Zedekiah's* Family were, as *Josepbus* (39) relates, *Daniel* and his three Brethren or Kinsmen, *Hananiab*, who was called *Shadrach* ; *Misbael*, who was called *Mesbach* ; and *Azariab*, who was called

(37) The *Septuagint* Translators and *Syriac* read in the *Hebrew* Text *Ubemispedotb* [יבכיספרות] and *Jispbedu* [יספרו] instead of the present Readings, *Ubemisprepotb* [יבכישרפית] and *Jisrepbu* [ישרפו]. The Difference is only in writing *Sin* ש for *Samech* ס, which have the same Sound very nearly ; and *Resch* ר for *Daleth* ד, which are very like in Form, both in the *Masorete* and *Samaritan* Text ; and placing it before the פ instead of putting it after it ; which Transpositions are not uncommon in the *Hebrew* Text. I wonder Commentators have taken no notice of this. The *Complutense* Copy follows the *Hebrew* and *Latin*, and was probably made from them.

(38) *Jos. Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 8. fin.*

(39) *Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 10. p. 533.* But *Josepbus* is mistaken ; and it appears from *Ezech. xxviii. 3.* that at this Time *Daniel* was renowned for his Wisdom at *Babylon*, i. e. in the eleventh Year of *Jeboiackin's* Captivity, ch. xxvi. 1.

Abed.

Abed-Nego: and *Daniel* had the Name of *Belteshazzar* or *Baltasar*, Dan. i. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.

In the latter End of the Year or Beginning of the next Year after the Conquest of *Judæa*, *Nabuchadnezzar* was resolved to take revenge on the Nations round about, who had been Confederates with the *Jews*, and had revolted from him: though they afterward deserted the *Jews*, and rejoiced at their Destruction. Therefore he sent an Army under *Nabuzaradan*, and subdued *Cæle-Syria* and the *Zidonians*, the *Moa-bites*, *Ammonites*, *Philistines*, *Edomites* and *Arabians*. The Devastation and Desolation of all these Countries were foretold by the Prophets *Jeremiah* and *Ezekiel*, Jerem. xlix. 1—34. ch. xxvii. 1—8. *Ezech.* xxv. through the whole Chapter: and long before by *Amos* ch. i. 9—15. ch. ii. 1, 2, 3. The *Ammonites* are particularly threatened by the Prophets for their rejoicing over the Ruin of *Jerusalem*, *Ezech.* xxv. 1—10. Jerem. xlix. 1—6. *Amos* ch. i. 13, 14, 15. as also the *Edomites* for the same Cause, *Amos* i. 11, 12. *Obadiab* v. 10—16. *Psalms* cxxxvii. 7. These Prophecies were fulfilled upon the *Ammonites*, when *Baalis* their King (who had sent *Ishmael*, *Jer.* xl. 14. the Son of *Nethaniah* to slay *Gedaliah* whom *Nabuchadnezzar* had set over the small Remains of the *Jews* who were left after the Captivity of the rest of the Nation) was attacked by the *Babylonian* Army under *Nabuzaradan*, who wasted his Country with Fire and Sword, and destroyed *Rabbah* the chief City, and carried away *Baalis* and most of the Nobles and Priests of *Ammon* into Captivity. The other Countries before-mentioned were all subdued and wasted in the same Year, which was the twentieth Year of the Reign of *Nabuchadnezzar* and the Year before *Christ* 585.

The next Year, which was the twenty-first of the Reign of *Nabuchadnezzar*, and the Year before *Christ* 584, *Nabuchadnezzar* began his Expedition against *Tyre*; and marched from *Babylon* with a great Army and laid Siege to it. *Ezekiel* foretold the Overthrow of this rich and populous City two Years before, in the 19th Year of *Nabuchadnezzar's* Reign, in his xxvith and xxviiiith Chapters. And in the latter Chapter he told *Itobal* King of *Tyre*, that for his Pride and Blasphemy, as well as for his rejoicing at the Fall of *Jerusalem*, he should be

slain in the taking of the City, ch. xxviii. 1—10. which accordingly came to pass in the fourteenth Year of the Siege when it was taken. *Tyre* was a very wealthy, populous and strongly fortified City, and had been able to withstand for several Years together all the Power of the *Assyrians* in the Reign of *Salmanasar*. It was famous for its extensive Trade and Commerce abroad, and its own rich Merchandise: and being open to the Sea received constant Supplies that Way, whereby it was able to hold out a *thirteen* Year's Siege against all the Forces of the King of *Babylon*.

Whilst *Nabuchadnezzar* lay before *Tyre* he sent *Nabuzaradan* with Part of the Army into *Judaea* to revenge the Death of *Gedaliah*, whom he had made Governour of the Land. But the Country was so desolate and thin of Inhabitants, the principal Persons being fled to *Egypt*, that he carried away captive no more than *seven hundred forty and five Persons*, Jerem. lii. 30. This was the last carrying away of the *Jews*, in the twenty-third Year of *Nabuchadnezzar*, and in the Year before *Christ* 582.

Nabuchadnezzar having *barrassed* and much wasted his Army before *Tyre*, after a thirteen Years Siege (40), took it and utterly destroyed it according to the Prophecy of *Ezechiel* in his whole xxvith Chapter. This was in the 26th Year of *Jeboiachin's* Captivity, and the 34th Year of *Nabuchadnezzar* beginning, and in the Year before *Christ* 571, and the latter End of the Year. This is evident from *Ezechiel* xxix. 17, etc. where *Tyre* is mentioned as being taken when the Prophet in the seven and twentieth Year of *Jeboiachin's* Captivity, and the first Day of the first Month, promised from God to *Nabuchadnezzar* the Conquest of *Egypt* as a Reward for his Service in taking and destroying *Tyre*. This shews that *Tyre* was taken the latter End of the Year before. But it must be observed that it was not the insular *Tyre* so renowned both before and afterwards for its Trade and Riches

(40) *Josephus* tells us that *Philostratus* in his *Phœnician* History related that *Nabuchadnezzar* besieged *Tyre* for thirteen Years, in the Reign of *Itobalus* King of *Tyre*. Φιλόστρατος ἐν ταῖς—Φοινικικαῖς ἱστορίαις (φησὶ) ὅτι ἔτεθ' ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπολιόμηκεν Τύρον ἔτη 13. βασιλεύοντι κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν Ἰθολάχης ὁ Τύρου. Ant. Jud. lib. x. c. 11. cont. Apion. lib. i. sect. 21. Syncel. Chronograph. p. 221.

by the *Greek* and *Roman* Historians, that was taken and demolished by *Nabuchadnezzar*; but it was the inland City called *old Tyre*, which was the ancient Seat of the *Tyrian* Kings, to which the insular *Tyre* was subject; and to which the Inhabitants of *Palæ-tyrus* or *old Tyre* fled with their Effects before *Nabuchadnezzar* took it: so that he found little Spoil in it. The insular *Tyre* continued rich and powerful to the Time of *Alexander the Great*, whose Conquest of it was foretold by the Prophet *Isaiab*, ch. xxiii. And *Bochart* (41) is mistaken in supposing the Prophecy of *Isaiab* to belong to this Conquest of *Tyre* by *Nabuchadnezzar*. The *Tyre* which *Nabuchadnezzar* subdued and demolished was never after rebuilt, as *Ezekiel* foretold, ch. xxvi. 14, 21. And therefore it was *old Tyre* which *Alexander* found in Ruins when he besieged the *Insular Tyre* prophesied of by *Isaiab*: and which, though he utterly destroyed and burnt it to the Ground, was soon after rebuilt, and (42) recovered its Greatness, Trade, and Riches in the Space of *seventy Years*, as the Prophet foretold, *Isai.* xxiii. 15—18.

(41) *Geog. Sac.* p. 161. See *Jameson's* *Spicileg. Antiq. Ægypt.* p. 416—419. and *Strab. Geograph. lib. xvi.* p. 1097, 1099. where it appears that the *Insular Tyre* was famous and flourishing in his Time. *Bochart* (*Geog. Sac. lib. iii.* p. 161.) to support his Mistake and reconcile it to *Esai.* xxiii. 12. where it is said: *Thou shalt no more rejoice, O thou oppressed Virgin, Daughter of Zidon; arise, pass over to Chittim; there also shalt thou have no Rest*; would have it read, *Cutijim* or *Cuthim*, i. e. *Susians*, instead of *Chittim* which signified the *Macedonians*. And so would have the Prophecy refer to the taking of *Tyre* by *Nabuchadnezzar*, and the *Tyrians* being carried captive into *Babylonia* or *Susiana*. All this is utterly wrong. And as *Chittim* is undoubtedly the true Reading both of the *Hebrew* Text and *Septuagint Greek* Version, this 12th verse before cited evidently shews that all the preceding Prophecy relates to the taking and Destruction of *Insular Tyre* by *Alexander* King of *Chittim* or *Macedonia*, in the Year before *Christ* 332, when this great and populous City was burnt and entirely demolished, and most of the Inhabitants slain. Those who remained and did not escape to *Carthage* were sold for Slaves to the *Greeks*, and sent Captives to *Macedonia*. So they passed over to *Chittim*, where they had no Rest; being in a miserable Servitude. Further, *Bochart* did not consider that they could not be sent to *Susiana* by *Nabuchadnezzar*, who had nothing to do in that Country, which was subject to the *Medes*: so void of all Foundation is the Opinion of this learned Man.

(42) *Strabo* saies agreeably to the Prophet, that *Tyre*, notwithstanding the Calamities it suffered when it was besieged and taken by *Alexander*, sur-

When *Nabuchadnezzar* took *old Tyre*, he carried captive to *Babylon* two of the Sons of *Itbobal* or *Etb-Baal*, called *Mer-Bal* and *Hirom*: but *Baal*, who was probably his Brother, reigned after him ten Years in *Insular Tyre*. This I gather from the *Tyrian Annals* or *Phœnician History* of *Philostratus*, which relates that, after the Death of *Balator* (43), the *Tyrians* sent to the King of *Babylon* to have *Mer-bal*, who was there, sent home to be their King, who reigned four Years; and upon his Death they sent again for his Brother *Hirom*, who reigned twenty Years. This shews that the *Tyrians* were then in Friendship with the *Babylonians*; and had a mind to have their ancient Government restored, (having been governed by *Judges* for seven Years and three Months after the Death of *Baal*) and to have one of their ancient Seed royal to reign over them.

It appears further from the *Tyrian Annals*, that *Cyrus* took *Babylon* in the (44) fourteenth Year of *Hirom*, and in the thirty-sixth Year after *Tyre* was taken by *Nabuchadnezzar*. For after *Itbo-Bal* and the taking of *Tyre*, *Baal* reigned *ten Years*; after him they had *Judges*, of whom *Ecnibal* ruled *two Months*: after him *Chelbes* was Judge *ten Months*: after him *Abbar* the High Priest ruled *three Months*: after him *Mytgan* and *Gerastratus* were Judges *six Years*: after them, or in the Interval between them, *Balator* reigned one Year: after his Death *Merbal* reigned *four Years*: after his Death his Brother *Hirom* reigned *twenty Years*. So from the taking of *old Tyre* by *Nabuchadnezzar* to the taking of *Babylon* by *Cyrus* was *thirty-five Years* and some odd Months. This Computation of the *Tyrian Annals* is of the greatest Importance in Chronology; and agrees exactly with the Scripture-Account of the seventy Years Captivity of the *Jews* at *Babylon*, which

mounted all its Misfortunes, and recovered its Greatness and Commerce. *Ἡτύχηος ἡ καὶ ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου πολιτεία ληφθεῖσα· ἀλλὰ τῷ τοῦτων συμφορῶν κατάρσει κρείττω, καὶ ἀνέλαβεν αὐτήν, τῇ τε ναυιλίᾳ.* Strabo wrote, I think, *τὴν τε ναυιλίαν*, and the Expression *ἀνέλαβεν αὐτήν, τῇ τε ναυιλίᾳ* is not *Greek*. Geog. lib. xvi. p. 1098. *Tyre* was taken and demolished and burnt by *Alexander* in the Year before *Christ* 332, and in the Year before *Christ* 262 it recovered its Trade and flourished again.

(43) Apud Joseph. cont. Apion. lib. i. p. 452.

(44) Ibidem.

commenced

commenced in the first Year of *Nabuchadnezzar*, and ended at their Return in the second Year of *Cyrus*. For I proved above, that *Tyre* was taken in the twenty-sixth Year of *Jeboiachin's* Captivity and the thirty-fourth Year of *Nabuchadnezzar*, which was in the End of the Year before *Christ* 571, and thirty-five Years reckoned thence down to *Cyrus's* taking *Babylon*, fixes the *Æra* of the taking of *Babylon* to the End of the Year before *Christ* 536. And so the *Jewish* Captivity ending in the second of *Cyrus* and the Year before *Christ* 535, it ended in the seventieth Year from the first of *Nabuchadnezzar* in the Year before *Christ* 604. This Computation places the taking of *Babylon* by *Cyrus* two Years lower than the Astronomical Canon of *Ptolemy*, according to the *Parisian* Copy, has placed it: but it agrees to *Syncellus's* Copy of the same Canon, and being fixed by *Ezechiel's* Date of the taking of *Tyre*, and by the Years of the *Tyrian* Annals deduced thence to *Cyrus*, it stands upon a surer Foundation than even that Canon does; which, I think, in the *Parisian* Copy plainly wants two Years in the Interval between *Nabuchadnezzar* and the taking of *Babylon* by *Cyrus*.

I wonder that this remarkable Coincidence of the ancient *Tyrian* Annals with *Ezechiel's* Date of the taking of *Tyre*, by which the seventy Years Captivity of the *Jews* at *Babylon* is fixed with the greatest Certainty, has not been rightly understood either by ancient or modern Chronologers (45).

(45) *Scaliger* the most learned of the Moderns by mistaking *Josephus's* saying that *Cyrus* reigned in the fourteenth of *Hirom*, as if he had meant the Beginning of his Reign in *Persia*, (whereas he plainly means his reigning at *Babylon*) has strangely misunderstood and misapplied the Computation of the *Tyrian* Annals from *Ithobal* and the Siege of *Tyre*, *Not. in Frag. ad calc. lib. de Emendat. Temp. p. 33—36*. And the very learned *Petavius*, though he saw that *Scaliger* was mistaken, has no less misunderstood those Annals, and given a very confused Account of the Siege of *Tyre* and of those Annals, *Doct. Temp. lib. ix. c. 63*. And the great *Usher* himself, though he has placed within a Year the true Time of the taking of *Tyre*, yet did not see that the fourteenth of *Hirom* in the *Tyrian* Annals was the first of *Cyrus* reigning at *Babylon*, though he has placed it in the Year wherein he thought *Babylon* was taken; but two Years before the Reign of *Cyrus*. This was owing to his placing the Reign of *Nabuchadnezzar* three Years too high; and putting a fictitious *Cyaxares* two Years before *Cyrus* at *Babylon*, *Annal. Vet. Test.*

An Error in the present Copies of *Josephus* has somewhat puzzled the Point, but may easily be corrected. *Josephus* having said that their Temple was destroyed in the eighteenth Year of the Reign of *Nabuchadnezzar*, adds that it lay waste for (46) *fifty Years*, to the second Year of *Cyrus*, when the Foundation (of a new Temple) was laid. And then he shews the Agreement of the *Tyrian Annals* from *Philostratus* to his Account, in their Computation of the Years from the Siege of *Tyre* (which *Josephus* supposes to have begun soon after the Burning of the Temple) to the *fourteenth* Year of the Reign of *Hirom*, when *Cyrus* took *Babylon*. This is the Point which *Josephus* is upon. He saies it appears from the *Tyrian Annals*, that *Nabuchadnezzar* laid Siege to *Tyre* in the Reign of *Itbobal*, and that the Siege continued *thirteen* Years. Then mentioning the Years of the *Tyrian* Kings and Judges who reigned after *Itbobal*, he adds, that the Term from the Beginning of the Siege of *Tyre* to the End of the Reign of *Hirom* was *fifty-four Years and three Months*. But *Cyrus*, he observes, took the Kingdom (of *Babylon*) in the *fourteenth* Year of *Hirom*. So six Years being deducted from the Reign of *Hirom*, who reigned twenty Years, the Interval between the Siege of *Tyre* and first of *Cyrus* appeared from the *Tyrian Annals* to be forty-eight Years and three Months; and to the second of *Cyrus*, when the *Jews* returned and laid the Foundation of their Temple, it was forty-nine Years and more: and therefore if *Nabuchadnezzar* began the Siege of *Tyre* in the nineteenth Year of his Reign, as *Josephus* seems to suppose, or the Year after the burning of the Temple; then the *Tyrian* Records agreed exactly with his Account of the Term of fifty Years from the Destruction to the rebuilding of the Temple. That which has puzzled this Account is, that in the present Copies of *Josephus* it is said (47) “in the *seventh* Year of the

p. 135—148. Sir *I. Newton* has followed the Error of *Ussher* in fixing the Reign of *Nabuchadnezzar* and of *Cyrus* at *Babylon*: and so from the *Tyrian Annals* he has placed *Cyrus* at *Babylon* two Years too high, *Chronol.* p. 306.

(46) The Copies of *Josephus* cont. Apion. lib. i. have it, (ὅτι ἔτη ἐπὶ α') for seven Years; but the true Reading is undoubtedly, (ὅτι ἔτη πεντήκοντα) for fifty Year, as *Havercamp* has published it; and as *Eusebius* read it in his Copy of *Josephus*; and also *Syncellus*, *Chronog.* p. 226.

(47) Εβδόμῃ μὲν γὰρ αὖτ' ἡ Ναβουχοδονοσοῦρος βασιλείας ἡγεσάτο πολιορκεῖν Τύρον.
“ Reign.

“ Reign of *Nabuchodonosor* (or *Nabuchadnezzar*) he began to besiege “ *Tyre* ”. As if *Josephus* had meant that *Nabuchadnezzar* began the Siege of *Tyre* in the *seventh* Year of his own Reign. But as it is evident from the Prophecy of *Ezekiel* in his 26th Chapter against *Tyre*, which was delivered in the *eleventh* Year of *Jehoiachin*’s Captivity, and the eighteenth Year of the Reign of *Nabuchadnezzar*, that *Tyre* was not then besieged; and *Josephus* himself supposed it on the Evidence of the Prophet not to be besieged till after the eighteenth Year of *Nabuchadnezzar*, and the burning of the Temple: it is plain that *Josephus* could not write that *Tyre* was besieged in the *seventh* Year of *Nabuchadnezzar*.

This Supposition also is inconsistent with what *Josephus* intended to shew from the Agreement of the *Phœnician* Annals with Scripture; *viz.* that it was *fifty* Years from the burning of the Temple to the rebuilding it in the second Year of the Reign of *Cyrus*: but from the *seventh* of *Nabuchadnezzar* to the second of *Cyrus* is by *Josephus*’s Reckoning *sixty-two* Years. Therefore it is certain that *Josephus* reckoned from the seventh Year of *Ithobal* King of *Tyre*, when *Nabuchadnezzar* began to besiege that City: and he wrote; “ in the seventh Year of the “ Reign of *Ithobal* *Nabuchadnezzar* began to besiege *Tyre*: ” And from thence to the fourteenth of *Hirom*, when *Cyrus* conquered *Babylon*, it was forty-eight Years and *three Months*; and to the second Year of *Cyrus*, in which the *Jews* returned from their Captivity, it was forty-nine Years and *three Months*. The foregoing Passage of *Josephus* being corrected, and the *Tyrian* Annals thereby set in a clear Light, they shew us the exact Time from the Siege of *Tyre* to the Reign of *Cyrus* at *Babylon*. This was forty-eight Years and some Months: so that when the true Time of that Siege is known, the true Time of the *Jewish* Captivity will be ascertained by it.

cont. Apion. lib. i. p. 452. The Passage, as it is, is not *Greek* or *Sense*. The sagacious *Scaliger* saw that it ought to be corrected and read; ἐβδόμῳ μὲν γὰρ ἔτει τῇ Εἰθωβάλλῃ βασιλείας οὗ Ναβουχοδονόσορος ἤρξατο πολιορκεῖν Τύρον. And this Emendation is confirmed by the Reading of the *Hafnian* MSS. which is; ἐβδόμῳ μὲν γὰρ ἔτει τῇ αὐτῇ (i. e. Εἰθωβάλλῃ) βασιλείας οὗ Ναβουχοδονόσορος ἤρξατο πολιορκεῖν Τύρον.

It

It is plain from *Josephus* placing the Return of the *Jews* in the second of *Cyrus*, *fifty Years* and no more after the eighteenth Year of *Nabuchadnezzar*, when according to him he destroyed the Temple, that he found just so many Years in the *Chaldaean* History of *Berosus*; and therefore that in this History taken from the *Chaldaean* Annals there were no more than *sixty-seven* Years compleat, or not sixty-eight Years from the first Year of *Nabuchadnezzar's* Reign to the second of *Cyrus*: and this is the Sum in the *Ptolemaic* Canon. But as the Captivity is reckoned in Scripture to be *seventy Years* either compleat or current, we may thence reasonably conclude that there is a Deficiency of about *two* Years in that Canon. Now if it appears that *Nabuchadnezzar* laid Siege to *Tyre* not in the eighteenth but in the twentieth or Beginning of the twenty-first Year of his Reign, and so took it after thirteen Years Siege in the End of the thirty-third or Beginning of the thirty-fourth Year of his Reign; the *Tyrian* Annals assuring us that it was thirty-six Years and some Months from the taking of *Tyre* to the second of *Cyrus*, it will be proved to be *sixty-nine* Years and some Months from the first of *Nabuchadnezzar* to the second of *Cyrus* at *Babylon*. And that this was so I think appears plainly from the Prophet *Ezechiel*, who represents that *Tyre* was taken in the End of the Year, which was the twenty-sixth of the Captivity of *Jeboiackin*: for in the twenty-seventh Year of *Jeboiackin's* Captivity, in the first Day of the first Month, which was the Beginning of the thirty-fifth Year of *Nabuchadnezzar*, when he had begun to invade *Egypt* immediately after the Conquest of *Tyre*, God promised him Success against *Egypt*, and that he should have the Spoil of it for his Service in destroying *Tyre*, where he had found no Spoil to reward his Army for their long Service, ch. xxix. 17, 18, 19, 20. This shews that *Tyre* was taken in the End of the preceding Year, and in the End of the thirty-third Year of *Nabuchadnezzar*: and there being thirty-six Years and some Months more to the Return of the *Jews* in the second of *Cyrus*, it is hence evident that from the first of *Nabuchadnezzar* to the Return of the *Jews* in the second Year of *Cyrus*, it was sixty-nine Years compleat, and the seventieth was current. This is the most precise Account of the Term of the *Jewish* Captivity; which

which began in the Year before *Christ* 604, and ended in the Year before *Christ* 535.

This Date shews also the exact Completion of the Prophecy of *Ezechiel*, concerning the ten Tribes of *Israel* bearing their Iniquities, or suffering the Punishment of them for one hundred and ninety Years, called *Days*, but interpreted in the Prophecy itself to be *Years*; *I have appointed thee each Day for a Year*, ch. iv. 4, 5, 6. The Number 190 *Days* or *Years*, is the Reading of the *Greek* Version (48) of the *Septuagint*: the *Hebrew* Text has 390 *Days* or *Years*, which has ever puzzled Interpreters in the Explication of the Prophecy, and can never be reconciled to the Scripture-History.

But the Sufferings of the ten Tribes for their Iniquities during the Term of 190 Years were exactly completed. They commenced in the fourth Year of *Hezekiah*, and the seventh of *Hoshea*, which was the Year before *Christ* 724, when *Salmanasar* King of *Assyria* laid siege to *Samaria*, which ended in the Captivity of the ten Tribes, 2 *Kings* xvii. 3—6. and this Captivity is said to be caused for their having *sinned against the Lord their God*, etc. ver. 7—23. From hence to the second Year of *Cyrus*, and the Year before *Christ* 535, it is 189 Years complete, when they were at Liberty to return to their own Country; and many of them did return along with the Tribes of *Judah* and *Benjamin*.

(48) The Number 190 is acknowledged by *Origen* to be the Reading of the *Septuagint* Version. *Montfauc.* Hexap. in loc. and also by *Jerome*, Com. in loc. *Origen* also saies, as is noted by *Flaminius Nobilius*, viz. ἐκ ἀγνοῦμεν δὲ τινα τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἔχειν ἑκατὸν ἢ πενήκοντα ἡμέρας· ἢ τὰ πλείονα δὲ ἐννεμήκοντα ἢ ἑκατὸν ἡμέρας· ἀλλ' ἐπισκεψάμενοι τὰς λοιπὰς ἐκδόσεις [Sc. Aq. Theodot. Sym.] ὄρομεν τετρακοσίας ἢ ἐννεμήκοντα ἡμέρας. *Jerome* saies, satis miror cur vulgata (lxx) exemplaria centum nonaginta annos habeant; et in quibusdam scriptum sit, centum quinquaginta: cum perspicue et Hebraicum et Aquila Symmachusque et Theodotio trecentos nonaginta annos teneant; et apud ipsos lxx, qui tamen non sunt scriptorum vitio depravati, idem numerus reperitur. Com. in loc. p. 721. And though *Polychronius* followed those Copies (of which the *Aldine* is one) which agreed with the *Hebrew*, and had 390 *Days*; yet he owns that other Copies had 190 *Days*. And this last Number, which is that of the *Vatican* and *Alexandrine* *Greek* Copies, is the Reading of the Copies of *Theodoret*; and also of *Georgius Syncellus*, Chron. p. 229.

They

They who follow the *Hebrew* Number of 390 Years, understand *the bearing of the Iniquities of the House of Israel*, which God is said to have laid upon the Prophet, whom he commanded to *lie upon his left Side* so many Days, to mean, not their *bearing* or suffering the Punishment of their Iniquities, but God's *Forbearance* in not punishing their Iniquities: and so they suppose the 390 Years commenced at the Revolt of the ten Tribes from *Reboboam*, when they began to commit Idolatry under the Government of *Jeroboam*; and this Revolt they place in the Year before *Christ* 975; and reckon the Years to end at the last carrying away of the *Jews* by *Nabuzaradan*, in the twenty-third Year of *Nabuchadnezzar*, according to the Words of *Jeremiah*, ch. lii. 30. which they place in the Year before *Christ* 584. If their Calculation was right, the Term is just 391 Years: but the true Years of this Interval are 395. But this is of little Moment.

The Fault of this Explication of the Prophecy is, that it will not do, admitting they rightly understood the Sense of the Words of it. For surely God's *Forbearance* of the ten Tribes was at an End, when their Kingdom was destroyed, and they with their King were carried into Captivity, and dispersed up and down in strange Countries. This Calamity was not the *Forbearance*, but the Beginning of the *Vengeance* of God upon this wicked and idolatrous People: and the last carrying away of the *Jews* had nothing to do with the House of *Israel* or the ten Tribes, who were carried away captive many Years before. Another Fault of the foregoing Explication is, that it is built on an erroneous Interpretation of the Sense of the Prophet, as if he meant to represent God's forbearing so many Years to take Vengeance on *Israel* for their Iniquities and Idolatries; whereas he meant, on the direct contrary, to typify God's actually taking Vengeance and punishing the House of *Israel* for their Iniquities: the Term of which was typified by the Prophet's lying in a painful Posture on his left Side without turning (in which he must have been miraculously supported) for so many Days as equalled the Number of the Years of it; and which was to end with their Restoration (with that of the House of *Judah*) and return from Captivity to their own Land.

This Sense of the Prophet's Words is fixed by a parallel Expression in the Book of *Numbers*, ch. xiv. where God tells the *Jews*, that for their Murmuring and Rebellion, in refusing to go up and take Possession of the Land of *Canaan* in the second Year after their coming out of *Egypt*, *their Carcases should fall in the Wilderness, and that their Children should wander in the Wilderness forty Years, and bear their [Father's] Whoredoms, untill their Carcases should be wasted in the Wilderness: after the Number of the Days in which they searched the Land, even forty Days (each Day for a Year) they should bear their Iniquities, even forty Years*, ver. 32, 33, 34. Here bearing Iniquities is evidently bearing or suffering the Punishment of them: and so it is in the Prophecy of *Ezekiel*; and so *Jerome* understood it: and therefore following the *Hebrew* Number of 390 Years, he reckoned from the sixth of *Hezekiah*, when *Samaria* was taken and an End put to the Kingdom of *Israel*, unto the fortieth Year of *Artaxerxes Mnemon*, whom he supposes to be the *Affuerus* who married *Esther*. This Calculation is not only wrong in the Number of Years, but ends above 200 Years after the Completion of the Prophecy; and so is entirely without Foundation: as likewise every other Explication is, which is founded on the Number of the *Hebrew* Text. But if we compute from Scripture the Time of the House of *Israel* bearing or suffering the Punishment of their Iniquities, from the Siege of *Samaria*, and the Captivity of the ten Tribes which immediately followed it, to their Redemption and Restoration in the second Year of *Cyrus*, we shall find it was exactly 190 Years current: and therefore we may safely conclude, that this is the true original Number of the *Hebrew* Text, which is happily preserved in the *Greek* Translation of the Septuagint; and the Completion of the Prophecy is thereby kept from being lost.

But it is not so easy to shew the fulfilling of the *forty Years*, for which Term the Prophet is said to *bear the Iniquities of the House of Judah*, by lying on his right Side *forty Days*, as all the Copies have it, *Ezech. iv. 6*. This Prophecy, I think, commenced either at the Captivity of *Jeboiachin*, whence *Jerome* computes; or rather at the Destruction of the City and Temple of *Jerusalem*; but in either Case it could not be completed within the Term of *forty Years*: for I

doubt not but it ended with the Decree of *Cyrus* or the Return of the *Jews*. No tolerable Explanation has yet been given of it, either by the ancient or most learned modern Chronologers ; and I confess that I am entirely at a Loss to shew the Completion of it, on Supposition of the Number *forty Years* or *Days*, being the true Number of the Prophet. I must leave it therefore unresolved : but if any Copy had *fifty Days* instead of *forty*, I should be inclined to think it the true Number, and it would easily shew the Completion of the Prophecy.

But to return to *Nabuchadnezzar*. *Tyre* being taken and utterly demolished, after a Siege of thirteen Years, *Nabuchadnezzar* marched his Army into *Egypt*, in the twenty-seventh Year of *Jeboiachin's* Captivity, and the thirty-fourth Year of his Reign, and in the Spring of the Year before *Christ* 570.

Nabuchadnezzar's Army met with little Opposition from *Apries* ; because he had just before lost a great Part of his Army in an Expedition against (49) *Cyrene* and *Barce*, and the Remainder revolted from him, as *Herodotus* and *Diodorus Siculus* inform us. *Nabuchadnezzar* therefore in a short Time over-ran the whole Country of *Egypt* from one End to the other ; from (50) *Magdol*, or *Magdolum*, at the entering into *Egypt*, unto *Siene*, which is at the furthest End of upper *Egypt*,

(49) *Herodot.* lib. ii. c. 161. *Diod. Sic.* lib. i. p. 79.

(50) The *Hebrew* Text in *Ezech.* xxx. 6. is *Memagdol Sune* [מִמַּגְדֹּל סוּנָה] which our Translators have rendered *from the Tower of Syene*, which leaves the Sense imperfect, the terminus ad quem not being added. The *Septuagint* has rendered it ἀπὸ Μαγδωλᾶς ἕως Συήνης, i. e. *from Magdolum to Syene*, and *Jerome* also : and so they read *Memagdol lesune*. And the initial *l* (*Lamed*) before *Syene*, or *Sune*, might be easily drop'd as following the preceding *l* in *Memagdol*, and be confounded with it by the Copier. And also in *Ezech.* xxix. 10. where the same utter Desolation of *Egypt* is foretold, and the *Hebrew* is rendered by our Translators, *from the Tower of Syene even unto the Border of Æthiopia* ; the *Septuagint* has rendered it *from Magdolum and Syene, and to the Border*, or utmost Bound of *Æthiopia* : *Jerome* has both the Readings. As *Syene* was upon the Border of *Æthiopia*, it could not be proper to express the Devastation of *Egypt* from one End to the other, by saying it was from *Syene* to *Æthiopia* adjoining to it : but if we understand here *Cush* rendered *Æthiopia* to mean *Arabia*, as it almost always does ; then from *Syene* to *Arabia* on the North Part of *Egypt* will be from one End of the Kingdom to the other.

upon

upon the Borders of *Æthiopia*. He ravaged with Fire and Sword all the Kingdom of *Egypt*: and the Army of *Apries*, consisting of *Arabians*, and *Libyans*, and *Æthiopians*, who were his Allies (*Ezech.* xxx. 5.) and of *hired Troops* (*Jerem.* xlv. 21.) who were *Ionians* and *Carians*, who first settled in *Egypt* in the Reign of *Psammitichus*, being routed, and many of them slain, the rest fled, as *Jeremiah* foretold: so that *Apries* was forced to surrender himself into the Hands of *Nabuchadnezzar*, who did not slay him, as (51) *Josephus* thinks he did, but restored him to his Kingdom, and made him tributary.

During the Ravage of the Country of *Egypt* by the *Babylonians*, most of the *Jews* who had fled thither after the Murder of *Gedaliah*, fell into their Hands, many of whom were slain, as *Jeremiah* had foretold, ch. xlv. 27. also ch. xlii. 16, 17. and others were carried Captive to *Babylon*, ch. xlv. 19.

In this War the whole Kingdom of *Egypt* was so wasted and depopulated by Fire and Sword, that it lay in a manner desolate for *forty Years*, as *Ezekiel* foretold, ch. xxix. 10, 11, 12. After which it began to be peopled, and to flourish again in the latter Years of the Reign of *Amasis*: but was always base, and subject to other Empires, as the Prophet foretold, *Ezech.* xxix. 14, 15. and ch. xxx. 13. It was first subject to the *Babylonians*; afterwards to the *Persians*; then to the *Greeks*, *Romans*, *Saracens*; and last of all to the *Turks*, to whom it is subject at this Day.

In the Destruction of *Egypt* by *Nabuchadnezzar* were completed the Prophecies of (52) *Nabum*, ch. iii. 8, 9, 10. and *Jerem.* xliii. 8—13. ch. xlv. 27—30. ch. xlv. 13—26. *Ezech.* ch. xxix. 30, 31, 32. The

(51) *Antiq. Jud.* lib. x. c. 9. he mistook the Words of the Prophet, who only saies, that *Pharaoh-Hophra* should be delivered into the Hands of *Nabuchadnezzar*, *Jerem.* ch. xlv. 30. ch. xlv. 25, 26.

(52) What is there rendered in our Translation as past, should have been translated as future, as it is in the *Greek Version*, and agreeable to the *Hebrew Idiom*, viz. *Art thou better than populous No* [i. e. *No-Amon*, or *Thebes*] *that is situate amongst the Rivers, that has the Waters round about it; whose Rampart is the Sea, and her Wall is from the Sea? Æthiopia* (or *Arabia*) *are her Strength—Put and Lubim are thy Helpers. Yet shall she be carried away, she shall go into Captivity, &c.* This was a Prophecy of the Devastation of upper *Egypt* by *Nabuchadnezzar*.

Prophet *Ezekiel* began to foretel the Conquest and Devastation of *Egypt*, by the Armies of *Nabuchadnezzar*, in the tenth Year of the Captivity of *Jeboiachin*, seventeen Years before it happened, and continued his Prophecy in the eleventh Year of the same Captivity. This appears from ch. xxix. 1, 2. and ch. xxx. 20—26. And the Destruction of it is represented to be in the seven and twentieth Year of that Captivity, ch. xxix. 17, 18, 19, 20. And in the xxx^d Chapter, the Nations which were his Allies, and supplied him with Troops, are particularly mentioned ver. 5. *Cush*, *Phut*, *Lud*, and *Gub*, that is (53) *Æthiopians*, *Libyans*, *Lydians* who lived in *Libya*, probably *Marmaricans*, and *Arabians*, as *Symmachus* rendered *Gub*. And all the great Cities of the *Upper*, *Middle*, and *Lower Egypt*, which were to be conquered and wasted with Fire and Sword, are also particularly related, ver. 13—18. These Cities were *Noph*, or *Memphis*, the Capital of the middle *Egypt*, ver. 13. *Zaan*, or *Tanis*, the chief City of the *Delta* in the lower *Egypt*: then *No*, that is *Diospolis*, or *Thebes*, the Metropolis of the Land of *Patbras*, i. e. *Thebais*, ver. 14. Then *Sin*, or *Pelufium*, the frontier City at the Entrance of *Egypt*; and *Aven*, or *On*, *Phibeseth*, and *Taphnes*; that is, *Heliopolis*, *Bubastus*, and *Daphne*, all situated in the *Arabian Nome*, ver. 15, 16, 17, 18. The City *No* is more especially devoted to Destruction, and is mentioned three Times; and the Multitude of *No* are threatened to be cut off, ver. 15. meaning that a great many *Jews*, who had fled to that City for Safety, and to be out of the Reach of the *Babylonians*, should there be slain with the *Egyptians*, as *Jeremiah* foretold, ch. xlv. 1, 27, 28. The vulgate *Latin*, or *Jerome*, renders *No* by *Alexandria*, which is a great Mistake; for *Alexandria* was not built till many Years after this Prophecy: nor does it mean *Diospolis* in the *Delta*, which was

(53) *Æthiopia* is the constant rendering of the *Hebrew Cush* in the *Greek* Version: and it almost always signifies *Arabia*, and not *Æthiopia* above the upper *Egypt*. Here it may mean *Æthiopia*. And amongst the Ancients *Arabia*, both on the East and West Side of the *Arabian Gulf*, and even *Arabia Felix* as far as *India* was called *Æthiopia*. See *Hom. Odyss. A. v. 23, 24.* and *Eustath. Com. p. 13. edit. Bas.* And *Strab. Geog. lib. i. p. 56—60.* And *Cellar. Geog. tom. ii. p. 951, 952, 953, 651, 652.*

near

near *Tanis*. It was undoubtedly the most ancient and famous City, called *No-Amon*, or *No-Ammon*, that is, the *City of Jupiter*, whom the *Egyptians* called *Aman*, or *Amnun*, as (54) *Herodotus* tells us; and which the *Greeks* called *Thebes*. It is called *No-Amon* by the Prophet *Nabum*, who foretelling the Devastation of it by *Nabuchadnezzar*, describes it very precisely, viz. that it was situate among the Rivers, that it had *Waters round about it*; whose *Rampart was the Sea*, and her *Wall was from the Sea*. *Æthiopia and Egypt were her Strength*. — *Phut and Lubim were her Helpers*, ch. iii. 8, 9. This Description answers very exactly to *Thebes* the great *Diospolis*. It was situate amongst the *Waters of the Nile* (55) which ran through it; and its Territories extended to the *Arabian*, or *Red Sea*, which was its *Rampart*, and *Wall* to defend it. *Æthiopia* also and the *upper Egypt* were her *Strength*; and *Arabia* and *Libya* were her *Helpers*: for the Boundary of *Thebais* extended to *Libya* on the *West*, *Æthiopia* on the *South*, and *Arabia* on the *North*. These Nations were anciently either (56) Allies or tributary to *Thebes*, the Seat of the Kingdom of *upper Egypt*.

Thus it appears how *Egypt* was ravaged by the *Babylonians*, from one End to the other of that Kingdom: and *Hopbra*, or *Apries*, who had proudly and blasphemously boasted, that *none of the Gods could deprive him of his Kingdom*, was deposed by *Nabuchadnezzar*, and forced to be his Tributary; and was also deserted by the *Egyptians* themselves.

The History of this Conquest of *Egypt* by *Nabuchadnezzar*, though so very remarkable, and so particularly related by the *Jewish* Prophets who lived at the Time of it, is not mentioned by the *Egyptian* Historians. It was either not recorded in their Annals, or it was concealed by their Priests from Foreigners, as being so great a Disgrace, and so fatal a Calamity to their Nation, from which it never after recovered. Therefore we find nothing of it in *Herodotus*, *Diodorus Siculus*, or

(54) Αμμὺν γὰρ Αἰγύπιοι καλέουσι τὸν Δία. lib. ii. c. 42.

(55) See Pausan. Attic. p. 40. Cellar. Geog. tom. ii. p. 826.

(56) Ἐν ταύτῃ δ' ἦν πρότερον τὰ βασιλεῖα τῆς Αἰγύπτου εἰς ἃ πολλὰς ἕφερον φόρους Λίβυες, Αἰγύπιοι, Αἰθίοπες, &c. Gr. Schol. ad Homer. in Not. in Steph. Byzant. voce Διοσπόλ.

Strabo. With the same Kind of Policy the *Egyptians* concealed the great and fatal Overthrow of their Army, which, with their King, was miraculously drowned in the *Red Sea*, when the *Israelites* passed through it under the divine Conduct of *Moses*.

But as the *Babylonians* would not fail to record these great Successes of *Nabuchadnezzar* against the *Egyptians*, and his Conquest of their Kingdom, which had strove both with the *Assyrians* and *Babylonians* for the Dominion of the Western *Asia*, from *Euphrates* to the great or *Mediterranean* Sea, we find them in the History of (57) *Berosus*, who related, that *Nabuchodonosor* subdued *Egypt*, *Syria*, *Phœnicia*, *Arabia*; and excelled in warlike Exploits all the *Babylonian* and *Chaldean* Kings who reigned before him. *Megasthenes* (58) mentioned his Conquest of *Libya*. And (59) *Syncellus* saies, that the ancient *Phœnician* Histories related, that *Nabuchadnezzar* (called *Nabuchodonosor*) conquered *Syria*, and *Egypt*, and all *Phœnicia*.

As soon as *Nabuchadnezzar* had left *Egypt*, and was gone to *Babylon* laden with Spoil and Captives, in the latter End of the Summer of the Year before *Christ* 570; *Apries* sent *Amasis*, a Man of Note and Interest amongst the *Egyptians*, to persuade those of his Army who had revolted from him to return to their Duty: but they declared *Amasis* King, who thereupon took upon him the Command of the Army, and rebelled against *Apries*, who having shamefully abused an *Egyptian* Nobleman [whom he sent to bring *Amasis* to him, because he had not brought him] by ordering his Nose and Ears to be cut off; the rest of the *Egyptian* Army deserted from him to *Amasis*: upon this he immediately armed his Foreign Auxiliaries, who were *Ionians* and *Carians*, and thirty thousand in Number, and marched against *Amasis* and the *Egyptians*, and gave him Battle near *Memphis*; in which the Auxiliary Troops fought with great Bravery; but being

(57) Κορήσκει φησὶ τὸν Βαβυλώνιον [Ναβουχοδονόσορον] Αἰγύπτῳ, Συρίᾳ, Φοινίκῃ, Ἀραβίᾳ, πάντας τε ὑπερβλέμενον ταῖς πράξεσι τὰς πρὸ αὐτοῦ Χαλδαίων ἢ Βαβυλωνίων βασιλεύχοντας. Joseph. cont. Apion. lib. i. p. 450.

(58) Ap. Jos. Antiq. lib. x. c. 11. p. 538. cont. Apion. lib. i. p. 451.

(59) Τῶν Φοινίκων παλαιαί τιες [ita leg. non ut edit. πάλαι αἰτινες] ἰσορῶσαι εἶναι πρὸς τὸν Ναβουχοδονόσον, ὅτι Συρίαν ἢ Αἰγύπτῳ ἢ πᾶσαν τὴν Φοινίκην κατέστρεψεν ἐν πολέμοις. Chronograph. p. 221.

overpowered by superior Numbers were defeated. *Apries* was taken alive and carried to *Sais*; where he was delivered up to the *Egyptians*, who *strangled* him (60).

The Prophet *Jeremiah* foretold, that God would *deliver Pharaoh-Hopbra, or Apries King of Egypt into the Hand of his Enemies, and into the Hand of them that sought his Life*, ch. xlv. 30. He foretold also that God would punish *Pharaoh and Egypt with their Gods*: and would *deliver them into the Hand of those that sought their Lives*, and into the Hand of *Nabuchadnezzar King of Babylon*, ch. xlvi. 25, 26. One Part of these Prophecies was remarkably fulfilled by *Nabuchadnezzar's* Conquest of *Egypt*, and having *Apries* in his Power, and making him tributary: and the other Part, of his being delivered into the Hand of those who sought his Life, was literally and very precisely fulfilled, when *Amasis*, upon the murmuring of the *Egyptians* that he let *Apries* live, who was both his and their Enemy, delivered him up to the *Egyptians*. who immediately *strangled* him. And *Ezekiel* also foretold, that he should be slain. For speaking of this *Pharaoh* he saies; *I have caused my Terror in the Land of the Living: and he shall be laid in the midst of the uncircumcised, with them that are slain with the Sword, even Pharaoh and all his Multitude, saith the Lord God*, ch. xxxii. 32.

Nabuchadnezzar being now at Rest from all his Wars, in the 35th Year of his Reign, and the End of the Year before *Christ* 570, he employed the Captives he had taken and brought to *Babylon*, in making those famous Buildings and Works which were the Wonder of the World. He enlarged (61) the Temple of *Belus*; and made the Compass of it a Square of two Furlongs on each Side, and a Mile in Circumference: and the Gates leading into it were of solid Brass. In this Temple he deposited all the sacred Vessels which he brought from the Temple of *Jerusalem*; and enriched it with several Images of Gold; it had also in it a large Table, and a Throne, all of Gold; and a golden Altar, with a great Variety of other rich Utensils for sacred Uses.

(60) Herodot. lib. ii. c. 162—169. Diod. Sic. lib. i. p. 79. Wessel.

(61) Herodot. lib. i. c. 181—183.

Nabuchadnezzar (62) also repaired and beautified the old City, and fortified it with a triple Wall, and also built a new City which he added to it, with a triple Wall also built round it : this new City added to the old one made the whole a Square of 120 Furlongs on a Side ; and the Circumference was 480 Furlongs, or sixty Miles. He also built a new Palace on the opposite Side of the River to that where the old Palace stood, and directly facing it : and the so much famed hanging Gardens were also his Work. But I have observed above, that it is probable that the new Palace and the hanging Gardens were built in the Beginning of his Reign, to oblige his Queen, who was a *Mede*, and the Daughter of *Cyaxares*. And the famous Banks of the River *Euphrates*, built with Brick and Bitumen, with the grand artificial Lake and Canal, made for receiving the Overflowings of it, are likewise ascribed, by *Abydenus* and other Writers, to *Nabuchadnezzar* : but (63) *Herodotus* ascribes the Bridge and these Works to a *Babylonian* Queen, whom he calls *Nitocris* the Wife of *Labynetus*, who is *Nabuchadnezzar*. The Truth may be, that all these Works were designed and begun by *Nabuchadnezzar* ; but that before he finished them he fell into his Distraction ; and so they were some of them finished by his Queen *Nitocris*, who had the Administration of the Kingdom of *Babylon* during his Madness, and on this Account they are ascribed to her. But the Bank, or River-Wall, was finished in the Reign of *Nabonidus* the last King of *Babylon* (*Beros.* apud *Jos. cont. Apion.* lib. i. p. 451.)

Nitocris also fortified the Passages leading out of *Media*, the shortest and most direct Way into *Babylonia*, for fear of *Astyages*, who was encreasing the *Median* Kingdom with new Conquests ; and had (64) subdued *Armenia* : and the *Babylonians* had Reason to be afraid of

(62) *Beros.* apud *Joseph. Antiq. Jud.* lib. x. c. 11. p. 537, 538. *cont. Apion.* lib. i. p. 450, 451. *Herodot.* lib. i. c. 178. *Philostat.* lib. i. c. 25.

(63) *Lib.* i. c. 184—186. *Philostat.* lib. i. c. 25. See *Prideaux. Connect.* Part i. b. 2. p. 133—148. edit. 8vo.

(64) *Xenophon* relates this, *Institut. Cyr.* lib. iii. p. 64. and the same appears from his second Book, p. 58.

him during the Disorder of their warlike King. And it appears from *Xenophon* (65), that the *Medes*, soon after the Death of *Nabuchadnezzar*, began to invade the *Babylonians*, who had formed a powerful League for the Conquest of *Media*.

Whilst *Nabuchadnezzar* was employed in his great Works at *Babylon*, he had the *Dream* mentioned in the second Chapter of the Book of *Daniel*; in which the Glory and Greatness of his Kingdom, and of three others which were to succeed it, was represented to him, under the Similitude of a great Image, *whose Head was of fine Gold, his Breast and his Arms of Silver, his Belly and Thighs of Brass, his Legs of Iron, his Feet (and Toes, ver. 41.) Part of Iron and Part of Clay, ver. 31, 32, 33.* Here four great Kingdoms are beautifully represented by an Image formed of four Kinds of Metals; these were the *Babylonian*, the *Medo-Persian*, the *Greek* and the *Roman* Empires. The first was the Head of Gold, as *Daniel* explains it, *viz. Thou, O King, art a King of Kings: for the God of Heaven hath given thee a Kingdom, Power, and Strength, and Glory. And wheresoever the Children of Men dwell, the Beasts of the Field and the Fowls of Heaven hath he given into thine Hand, and hath made thee Ruler over them all: thou art this Head of Gold, ver. 37, 38.* The second Kingdom, or *Medo-Persian*, is said to be of an *inferior* Metal, *viz. Silver*: from which the Prophet, with great Delicacy, passeth to the mention of the third Kingdom

(65) Institut. Cyr. lib. i. p. 22. *Xenophon* supposes that the War between the *Medes* and *Babylonians* commenced in the Reign of *Cyaxares*, Son of *Astyages* King of *Media*, and of *Cambyfes* the Father of *Cyrus* King of *Persia*: all which is mere Fiction; and neither agrees to Chronology or History. For it is evident that this was the War in which the King of *Babylon* (*Niriglissar*, or *Niricassolassar*, whom *Xenophon* calls King of *Affyria*) was slain by the *Medes* and *Persians*, who fought under *Cyrus*, lib. iv. p. 88, 111. And this, according to the *Ptolemaic* Canon, was in the Year before *Christ* 556, and all ancient Historians agree, that *Cyrus* began to reign in *Persia* in the first Year of the 55th Olympiad, in the Year before *Christ* 560, or 559. So that his Father *Cambyfes* must have been dead before this War began. And the King of *Media*, who then reigned, must have been *Astyages* the Grandfather of *Cyrus*, who the Year after, upon the Death of *Laboroso-archad*, or *Belshazzar*, took the Kingdom of *Babylon*, as is related by the Prophet *Daniel*, ch. v. 30, 31. But this will be particularly shewn hereafter.

without adding any more, because he would not tell the King that the second Kingdom was to destroy his. The third Kingdom was of *Brass*, and was to *bear Rule over all the Earth*, ver. 39. For the *Greek*, or *Macedonian* Kingdom, was of greater Extent than either of the former. The fourth Kingdom is said to be *as strong as Iron*, and was, like Iron which breaketh all Things, to subdue and break to pieces all the other three : and the *Roman* Empire not only subdued all the others ; but its Strength also was seen in the Duration of it ; for it continued for 1200 Years, and more.

Josepbus (66) thinks this Dream of *Nabuchadnezzar* was two Years, or in the second Year, after the Overthrow of *Egypt* ; seeming to understand the Words of *Daniel*, ch. ii. 1. as if it was said ; *In the second Year of the Reign of Nabuchadnezzar*, after the finishing his Wars by the Conquest of *Egypt* : and so it was probably in the Year after this Conquest or in the Year before *Christ* 569. And this agrees well with the Prophet's Description of the Greatness of the *Babylonian* Empire, which was then in the Height of its *Power* and *Glory*. *Petavius* thinks this Dream happened to *Nabuchadnezzar* after he had ended his Wars by the Conquest of *Egypt* ; but then he is mistaken in placing it six or seven Years higher than I have done, viz. in the Year before *Christ* 576. For *Egypt* was subdued after *Tyre*, and *Tyre* was taken, in the Year before *Christ* 570 beginning, or 571 ending. But *Daniel's* Description of the *Babylonian* Kingdom no way agrees to the *second Year* of the Reign of *Nabuchadnezzar*, when he had but just begun to enlarge his Kingdom by the Reduction of *Phœnicia* and *Cœle-Syria*. Besides it is highly probable that *Daniel* was not carried to *Babylon* so soon as the second Year of *Nabuchadnezzar* : but that he was taken captive and brought thither either in the last Year of *Jeboiakim*, or with *Ezechiel*, and the noble Youths who were Captives with *Jeboiachin*, his Son, the same Year. And farther, it is expressly said, ch. i. 5, 18. that *Daniel* and his three Kinsmen were educated *for three Years* in the *Language*, *Learning*, and *Customs* of the *Chaldæans*, before they were brought before the King, or permitted to converse with him :

(66) *Antiq. Jud.* lib. x. c. 10. p. 534.

and it is evident from ch. ii. 13, 17. that *Daniel* and his three Kinsmen did not then live in the King's Palace, (where they were educated) when he interpreted the Dream, but in *his own House*. So that there is no Ground or Reason to place this Dream in the second Year of the Reign of *Nabuchadnezzar*, after the Death of his Father, or in the Year before *Christ* 603, with *Usher*, *Prideaux* and others (67).

Soon after the forementioned Dream, and in the same Year, *Nabuchadnezzar* having enlarged and adorned the Temple of his God *Bel* or *Belus*, out of the rich Spoils which he had taken in his Wars, made the *golden Image* mentioned *Dan. iii.* which was in Height (with the Pedestal) *threescore Cubits*, and in *Breadth six Cubits*. This seems most probably to have been a Colossal Statue of his God (68) *Bel*, which the King set up in the Plain (69) of *Dura*, in the Province of *Babylon*,

(67) The *Greek* Scholiast on the Place, *Cedrenus* Compend. Hist. p. 93. and *Syncellus*, Chronograph. p. 230. all place this Dream in the twentieth Year of *Nabuchadnezzar*, or the second after his Destruction of the City and Temple of *Jerusalem*. But the Year I have put it under, seems more probable. The Reader must judge for himself.

(68) *Jerome* Comm. in loc. thinks it was a *Statue of himself*, which he set up to be worshiped, and the *Assyrian* and probably the *Babylonian* Kings after them, both dead and living, were worshiped by their Subjects. This appears from *Judith*, ch. iii. 8. and ch. vi. 2. And this was the Custom of the *Persians* by the Institution of *Cyrus*: and the Images of these Kings were worshiped as if they were the Kings themselves. See *Briffon*. de Reg. *Persar.* p. 22, and 31. But this Image seems to have been the Statue of the God *Bel*, as may be inferred from *ŷ* 12, 14, 18. where they who refused to worship the Image, are said not to serve the Gods of *Nabuchadnezzar*. See the Account of this Image in *Prideaux's* Connect. B. ii. p. 142, 143. The *Greek* Version maketh the Time of the Dedication of this golden Image to have been in the eighteenth Year of *Nabuchadnezzar*; and so the *Arabic* Version; meaning the eighteenth Year after the Destruction of the City and Temple of *Jerusalem*: which was the thirty-sixth Year of *Nabuchadnezzar*. And so *Cedrenus* and *Syncellus* understood it, Compend. Histor. p. 93. Chronograph. p. 230. But it must have been the Year before.

(69) The *Septuagint* Version (as *Jerome* tells us Comm. in loc.) rendered *Dura* by *οὐρίβολον*. So the Plain of *Dura* was an Area belonging to the Temple of *Belus*, where this golden Image of *Bel* was set up in the sacred Ground belonging to the Temple, which was a Mile in Compass. *Arrian* relates,

and commanded all his Subjects to worship it, under the dreadful Penalty (to those who refused) of being cast into a Furnace of Fire, ver. 6.

God designing to punish *Nabuchadnezzar* for his Impiety in setting up the golden Image, and causing it to be worshiped, and for his great Pride and Wickedness, soon after shewed him in a second Dream, ch. iv. of a great and flourishing Tree which was suddenly cut down, that he should in a little Time be deprived of all his Greatness and Power: and losing his Understanding be driven out of his Kingdom, and live a most wretched solitary Life amongst Beasts for *seven Years*; and after that be restored to his Kingdom.

This Judgment fell upon him at the End of a Year, in the thirty-seventh Year of his Reign, and in the Beginning of the Year before *Christ* 568. For whilst he was walking in the *hanging Gardens* of his new Palace at *Babylon*, from whence he had a full Prospect of the whole City, the Walls and Gates of which were newly finished, he proudly boasted of the great Works which he had done; and of the Power and Grandeur of his Kingdom, saying: *Is not this great Babylon, which I have built for the House (the Metropolis) of the Kingdom, by the Might of my Power, and for the Honour of my Majesty,* Dan. iv. 30. But whilst he was speaking, there came a Voice from Heaven, which told him, *that his Kingdom was departed from him*: and that he should *be driven from amongst Men*, and live amongst Beasts for (70) *seven Times* or Years, in a brutal manner.

Exposit. Alex. lib. vii. p. 480. that the *Assyrian* Kings consecrated a large Tract of Land for the Worship of *Belus*: and that an ancient Temple was built for him, and a great Revenue settled upon it for providing Sacrifices to be offered to him. There is no Doubt therefore but this Colossus was erected within an inclosed Area of the Temple *Belus*. And the *Chaldeans* told *Herodotus*, that there had been in one of the Courts of the Temple of *Belus* a Statue of massy Gold, which was in Height twelve Cubits, which *Xerxes* Son of *Darius* carried away with the other Plunder of the Temple, lib. i. c. 183. But if this was the Image which *Nabuchadnezzar* set up, it must have been more than twelve Cubits in Height; because *Daniel* saies the Breadth of it was *six Cubits*.

(70) *Seven Times* which are mentioned ch. iv. 16, 23, 25, 32. signify literally *seven Years*: and so *Josephus* interprets them, Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 10.

Immediately

Immediately *Nabuchadnezzar* was seized with a Madness, by which he was deprived of his Senses and Understanding ; and fled out of *Babylon*, and lived in the Fields amongst the Beasts ; and did eat Grass like Oxen, and lay upon the Ground as they did ; till his Hair was grown long and shagged like the (71) *Main of a Lion*, and *his Nails like Birds Claws*, ver. 32, 33.

This Madness was one of the ferine Kind mentioned by ancient (72) Physicians : under which they who were seized with it ran out of their Houses and lived in Fields, Mountains and Desarts, and amongst Tombs, howling like Dogs or Wolves, whence the Distemper (73) had its Name ; and cutting and tearing their Flesh with Stones and Thorns. *Nabuchadnezzar* in his Madness might imagine himself to be a Bull ; and his Blood and Constitution might be so altered into a ferine State that he ate and digested Grass like a Beast whilst he continued under his Distraction.

But in other Prophecies of this Book a *Time* or *Year* is 360 Years, as in ch. vii. 25. ch. xii. 7. every Day being reckoned a Year. And this latter is the mystical and prophetical *Time* or *Year* of *Daniel*. But that *Times* or *Years* are to be understood in the common and literal Sense in the fourth Chapter of *Daniel*, is evident from the History of *Nabuchadnezzar* ; and their being the Term of a Distemper which was soon to fall upon him, and to distract him for seven Years. This Sense of *Times* signifying *Years* is proved from *Dan.* xi. 13. where instead of our *English* Translation, *after certain Years*, it should have been rendered, *at the End of Times*, i. e. *Years* ; which is the true Sense of the *Hebrew* Words, and not *Times of Years* : for *Times* and *Years* are not put in Construction with, but are in Apposition to each other ; and so the one explains the other. The *Hebrews* called *Years* *Sanim* שנים, and the *Chaldeans* called them *Idnin* ידנין, *Times*.

(71) The *Chaldee* has *Eagles* instead of *Lions*. But it is not so proper to compare the Hair of a Man to Eagles Feathers, as to the Hair or Main of a *Lion*. Therefore *Lions* is most probably the original Reading of *Daniel*, which is preserved by *Theodotio's Greek* Version ; and was the Reading of the old *Greek* Vulgate ; and also of the old *Latin* Vulgate, which was derived from it ; and which is found in *Tertullian*, lib. de Pœnitent. in fin. and also in the *Armenian* Version.

(72) Oribasius, Aetius, Ægineta, lib. iii. c. 16. Actuar. lib. i. περ. Διαγν. παθ. c. 35. See Freind's Hist. of Physic, Vol. i. p. 18, &c.

(73) Κυναιθραπία, Λυκαίθραπία.

Josephus

Josephus (74) saies, that during *Nabuchadnezzar's* seven Years Madneſs, no one durſt meddle with the Adminiſtration of the Kingdom. But the *Jews* had a (75) Tradition, that *Evilmerodach* his Son took the Government into his Hands during his Father's Diſorder: from whence ſome reckoned twelve Years to his Reign, viz, ſeven in his Father's Life Time, and five after his Death. It is more probable that his (76) Queen *Nitocris* managed the Affairs of the Empire; and that *Nabuchadnezzar* had now and then lucid Intervals, in which he was ſenſible of the juſt Judgment of God which was fallen upon him for his Pride, Impiety and Cruelty; and prayed to the God of Heaven to deliver him from his Miſery and Diſtraction; and to reſtore him to his Senſes and his Kingdom. In the ſeventh Year of his Madneſs his Underſtanding returned to him; and he was reſtored to his Kingdom, and re-eſtabliſhed in his former Greatneſs and Majeſty: and he publiſhed a Proclamation throughout his Kingdom, by which he acknowledged the Power of the moſt high God and King of Heaven, and the Wonders of his Providence, and the Juſtice of his Judgments; whereby God had humbled him for his Pride and Impiety, ch. iv. 34—37. and he continued praizing the Power and righteous Providence of God as long as he lived. *Nabuchadnezzar's* Recovery and Reſtitution to his Kingdom happened in the forty-third Year of his Reign and in the Year before *Chriſt* 562. After this he lived about one Year, and died in the Year before *Chriſt* 561, having reigned forty-three Years.

Evil-Merodach, ſo called from the *Babylonian* Idol *Merodach*, mentioned *Jerem.* l. 2. ſucceeded his Father *Nabuchadnezzar* in the Kingdom of *Babylon*: and ſoon after he came to the Throne, he ordered *Jeboiachin* King of *Judab* to be taken out of Priſon, after he had lain there by the Cruelty of *Nabuchadnezzar* almoſt thirty-ſeven Years; and gave him royal Robes to put on, and advanced him above all the Kings and Princes that were in *Babylon*; and admitted him to eat at his own Table, where he had a ſettled daily Proviſion allowed him

(74) *Antiq. Jud.* lib. x. c. 10.

(75) *Apud Syncel. Chronograph.* p. 230.

(76) See *Herodot.* lib. i. c. 185.

suitable to his Dignity as long as he lived, *2 Kings* xxv. 27—30. *Jer.* lii. 31—34.

The Author of the Addition to the Prophet *Jeremy*, ch. lii. 31. has set down both the Month and the Day of the Month in which *Evil-Merodach* released *Jeboiachin* out of Prison and advanced him above all the Kings who were with him in *Babylon*. He saies it was the 25th Day of the 12th Month: so it was on the Day preceding the great annual Festival with which the *Babylonians* ended the old Year and began the new Year. This Festival, which the old *Persians* received with their Year from the *Babylonians*, began on the 26th Day of the 12th Month, that is, *February*, and continued ten Days to the End of the Month, which had thirty-five Days, [five being intercalary] and also the first Day of the new Year (77). At this Time all appeared in better Attire than ordinary, and the Kings bestowed Honours on those they favoured; and the Rich gave Presents to the poorer Sort. This Time therefore seems to be chosen on purpose by *Evil-Merodach* to release *Jeboiachin* from his Confinement, that he might partake of

(77) Istos appendices seu adscitios dies celebrabant veteres (Persæ) in fine mensis Aban (i. e. Februarii) hoc tempus magni facientes vestes meliores induendo, et lætitiā agendo et geniis indulgendo; largiore potu et delicatioribus cibus et fructibus epulas instruendo, Hyde, Hist. Relig. vet. Pers. p. 268. The same learned Person gives a particular Account of the entire eleven Days Festival, viz. Apud vetustissimos Persas Aban fuit mensis duodecimus seu totius anni ultimus: ideoque appendicum festum etiam usque hodie a Persarum Magis in fine hujus mensis celebratur; quod est antiqui mensium ordinis indicium certissimum—hoc autem appendicum festum durabat per decem dies; scilicet a vicesimo sexto hujus mensis die ad finem quinque appendicum: ideoque libri Mugi Autor narrat, quod mensis Aban 26^{to} et sequentibus diebus Magi solebant pulmenta et alios cibos parare, quos in summis turrium tectis ponentes relinquebant, ut *magnatum* seu *Heroum Spiritus* sive *Genii*, illuc venientes, eorundem nidoribus oblectarentur et reficerentur. Hocce itaque appendicum festum decenniale (Annum terminans) excepit alia novi anni festivitas in primo Adur; adeo ut hoc totum tempus, per undecim dies durans, festivale fuerit, ibid. c. xix. p. 248. But the Day of *Jeboiachin's* Advancement is said to be the twenty-seventh Day of the 12th Month, *2 Kings* xxv. 27. which Day was the second of the Festival of the 12th *Chaldean* Month, which was the same with the 12th Month of the Ecclesiastical Year of the *Jews*.

the Pleasures of this Festival, and begin to enjoy the Dignity and Honour he was advanced to on this universally joyful Occasion.

Evil-Merodach was a Prince of a very dissolute and tyrannical Behaviour; and after two (78) Years Reign, according to the *Ptolemaic* Canon and *Berosus*, he became so intolerable, that *Neriglissar*, who had married his (79) Sister, entered into a Conspiracy against him, and slew

(78) *Synceilus's* Copy of *Ptolemy's* Canon gives to the Reign of *Evil-Merodach* three Years, Chronog. p. 208. Other ancient Writers and the Ecclesiastical Canon give him five Years. But three Years seems to be the truest Time from the Death of *Nabuchadnezzar* to the Death of *Evil-Merodach*, which Term I follow. See Chronog. Syncei. p. 209.

(79) Christian Writers differ about *Neriglissar*; some made him the Son of *Nabuchadnezzar*, called *Baltazar* or *Belsazzar*, Dan. v. 1. and that he was the legitimate Brother of *Evil-Merodach*, whom he slew. Others thought he was Brother-in-Law to *Evil-Merodach*, having married his Sister. *Eusebius* makes him the Brother of *Evil-Merodach*, and the same with *Baltasar*, Chron. p. 126. *Cedrenus* calls him Brother to *Evil-Merodach*, Comp. Hist. p. 97. *Sulpicius Severus* calls him the younger Brother of *Evil-Merodach*, Sac. Hist. lib. ii. c. 8. p. 269. *Zonaras* makes him to be Brother of *Evil-Merodach*, Annal. lib. iii. p. 123. and *Synceilus* calls him Brother-in-Law to him, Chronog. p. 231. But all agreed that *Neriglissar* was *Baltasar* or *Belsazzar*, as he is called in the Ecclesiastical Canon. See Syncei. Chronog. p. 209, and p. 230. But it is past all Doubt that *Neriglissar* married the Sister of *Evil-Merodach*, and so was his Brother-in-Law: that he also slew *Evil-Merodach*, and reigned after him four Years: that he left a Son called *Laborosoarchod*, who having reigned nine Months was slain for his mal-Administration by his Courtiers, one of whom, a *Babylonian*, called *Nabonnidus*, but not of the royal Family, was chosen King, and was the King of *Babylon* whom *Cyrus* conquered. All this Account of the Succession of the *Babylonian* Kings from *Nabuchadnezzar*, we have from the unquestionable Authority of *Megasthenes* cited by *Abydenus*, and of *Berosus* in *Josephus*. Their Words are, viz. Ὁ δὲ οἱ παῖς *Εὐιμαλάρχου* [leg. *Εὐιμαρσάρχου*] ἐβασίλευσε. τὸν δὲ ἐκδεσθῆς ἀπικείμενος *Νηργλισάρης* λέπει παῖδα *Λαβασοάρχακον*. τὰς δὲ ἀποθαινόντων βιαιῶς μέρω, *Ναβονίδου* ἀποδεικνύει βασιλέα προσήκοιαν εἰ εἶεν. τῷ δὲ *Κῦς* ἐλὼν *Βαβυλῶνα* *Καρμανίης* ἡγεμονίην δωρεῖ. Apud *Euseb. Præp. Evang.* lib. ix. c. 41. p. 457. *Berosus* λαίης, viz. *Ναβουχοδονόσου* μὲν—ἐμπεσὼν εἰς ἀρρώστιαν, μετ' ἡλλάξας τὸν βίον, βεβασίλευώς ἔτη τεσσαρσχοῦνταίῃα τῆς δὲ βασιλείας κύριον ἐγένετο ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ *Εὐιμαρσάρχου*. ὅτε προσὰς τῶν πραγμάτων ἀνόμως ἐκείσας, ἐπεβλάβεῖς ὑπὲρ τῆς τῆς ἀδελφῆς ἐχούσης αὐτῆς *Νηργλισσοῦρας*, ἀνῆρέθη βασιλεύσας ἔτη δύο. μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἀνακρεῖναι τῶν, ἀφ' ὧν ἀρχὴν τὴν ἀρχὴν ὁ ἐπεβλάβεας αὐτῆς *Νηργλισσοῦρας* ἐβασίλευσεν ἔτη τέσσαρες. τὰς δὲ υἱὸς *Λαβορσοάρχακος* ἐκν-

him.

him. About this Time died at *Babylon*, or was slain in the Conspiracy, *Jeboiachin* King of *Judah*: because it is said that *Evil-Merodach* maintained him at his own Table so long as he lived, 2 *Kings* xxv. 29, 30.

Neriglissar, called in *Ptolemy's Canon* *Niricassolassar*, derived from *Nergal* and *Asar*, two *Babylonian* Gods; took the Government upon the Death of *Evil-Merodach* in the Year before *Christ* 558. The Reason of placing his Reign to the Year before *Christ* 558 rather than in the Year 559, according to the *Parisian* Copy of *Ptolemy's Canon*, is given above in the 78th Note.

Neriglissar was a Prince beloved by the *Babylonians* for his (80) Bravery and just Government. But he was ambitious and desirous to bring the *Medes* into Subjection to the *Babylonian* Empire: and for this End he formed a powerful Confederacy with *Cræsus* King of *Lydia*; the King of *Cappadocia*; both the *Phrygians*, the *Carians* and *Paphlagonians*; the *Cilicians*, and some of the *Indians*. With the Assistance of these Allies, and a vast Army raised amongst his own Subjects, he prepared for a War against the *Medes*. The (81) King of *Media* having Intelligence of this Preparation and intended Invasion from the *Babylonians*, sent for *Cyrus* out of *Persia* (82) to his Assistance, who was then according to *Xenophon* about twenty-seven Years of Age. On his Arrival with an Army of thirty-thousand (83) *Persians*, he was made General of the *Medes* also. His first Expedition was

εἶδσε τῆς βασιλείας παῖς ὦν μῆνας ἑνέκ. Ὁπὲρ ἐλθὼν δὲ ἡ ἀρχὴ τὸ πολλὰ ἐμφαίνειν κακοή-
θη, ὑπὸ τῷ φίλῳ ἀπελυμπανίσθη. ὁπολομένη ἡ τέχνη, σιωπῶντες οἱ ὁπὲρ ἐλθόντες αὐ-
τῷ, κοινῇ τὴν βασιλείαν ἐβίβησαν Ναβοννῆδω τινὶ τῶν ἐκ Βαβυλῶν. ὅντι ἐκ τῆς αὐ-
τῆς ὁπισυτάσεως.—ἔσσης ἡ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτῆς ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ ἀκαδεκάτῳ ἔτει προεξεληλυ-
θὼς Κύρος ἐκ τῆς Περσίδος μὲν δυνάμει πολλῇ — Βαβυλῶνα καὶ ἀλαβόρην.
κ. τ. λ. Apud Jos. cont. Apion. lib. i. p. 451, 452.

(80) *Xenoph.* *Cyr. Institut.* lib. iv. p. 111. edit. *Francos.* 1596.

(81) *Xenophon* supposed this King of *Media* to be *Cyaxares* Son of *Astyages*. But *Cyaxares* is a fictitious King; and *Astyages* was now King of *Media*. This is evident because *Tigranes* the first was not yet King of *Armenia*; and he reigned when *Astyages* was King of *Media*, as we learn from *Moses Chorenensis*, *Hist. Armen.* lib. i. c. 23, 24, etc.

(82) *Xen.* *ibid.* lib. i. p. 22.

(83) *Xen.* *ibid.* lib. ii. init.

against the (84) King of *Armenia*, who thinking the *Medes* would not be able to withstand so formidable a Confederacy against them, took the Opportunity of revolting (85) from them, and refused to pay Tribute or to send his Quota of Auxiliaries to the War. *Cyrus* entered *Armenia* with a small Body of chosen Men under Pretence of a hunting Match, before there was any Intelligence of his coming; and being followed and joined with an Army of *Medes*, he sent a Message to the King of *Armenia* commanding him forthwith to come to him with his Troops and Tribute. The Message so surprized and terrified him, that he fled and sheltered himself in the Mountains: but being surrounded by the Troops of *Cyrus*, he was forced to surrender himself Prisoner. *Cyrus* generously restored him to his Liberty and Kingdom, upon Promise of his sending the Tribute and Auxiliaries which he demanded of him, and which accordingly were sent by the King of *Armenia* (86).

After this, in the fifth Year of *Neriglissar*, and in the Year before *Christ* 554, the Armies of the *Medes* and *Persians* under *Cyrus*, and of the *Babylonians* and their Allies under *Neriglissar*, met in the Field of Battle, wherein *Neriglissar* was slain and the *Assyrian* Army routed, and *Cyrus* got a compleat (87) Victory.

Upon the Death of the King of *Babylon*, *Cræsus* took upon him the Command of the vanquished and flying Army, which he rallied together as well as he could: but *Cyrus* (88) pursued them, being joined by a Body of *Hyrceanians*, who revolted to him, and fell upon them before they were aware, and slew the greatest Part of them, especially of the *Babylonians*, *Arabians*, and *Cappadocians*. Upon this *Cræsus* fled into his own Country. *Neriglissar* being slain after he had reigned four Years was succeeded by his Son *Laborosoarchod* in the Year before *Christ* 554.

(84) This King of *Armenia*, whom *Xenophon* does not name, is called *Ernandus* by *Moses Chorenensis*, who also makes him the Father of *Tigranes*, as *Xenophon* does, *Hist. Armen. lib. i. c. 21, 23.*

(85) *Xen. Cyr. Institut. lib. ii. p. 58.*

(86) *Ibid. lib. ii. et iii. p. 58—70.*

(87) *Ibid. lib. iii. in fin. and lib. iv. p. 88.*

(88) *Ibid. lib. iv. p. 95, 96.*

Neriglissar

Neriglissar is evidently the *Babylonian* King whom *Xenophon* relates to have been slain in the War between the *Medes* and *Babylonians*, whom he calls *Assyrians*: and it is also evident that the King of *Assyria* or *Babylon*, who succeeded him, and was not long after slain in his Palace at *Babylon*, was his Son *Laborsoarchod*. *Xenophon* saies that he was the Son of that King who was slain by *Cyrus*, and therefore was *Laborsoarchod*, whom *Megasthenes* and *Berosus* tell us was the Son of *Neriglissar*, as shewn above. *Laborsoarchod* was so called from the *Babylonian* Gods, *Lebo*, that is (89) *Nebo*, *L* being put for *N* as in other Words, *Asar* and *Cbod* or *Cbad*; and so it is the (90) inverse Name of *Nabuchadnezzar*.

This King reigned no more than nine Months, as *Berosus* tells us; and therefore his Name is not inserted in the Astronomical Canon of *Ptolemy*, who left out the Names of all the Kings who reigned not an entire Year.

Laborsoarchod was very (91) young when his Father *Neriglissar* was slain; but he was very cruel, wicked, and profligate in his Manners; and on this account was slain by his Courtiers in the midst of his Revels at a Feast. He is therefore the *Belshazzar* of *Daniel*: and his Character of a luxurious, wicked, cruel, and profane Prince, and the Manner of his Death, as being slain at a Feast whilst he was drinking Wine out of the sacred Vessels of the *Jewish* Temple in his Palace at *Babylon*, as related in the fifth Chapter of the Prophet *Daniel*, both these agree to the Account of *Megasthenes* and *Berosus*, given above, concerning him, and especially to the History of *Xenophon*. He saies of this King (92), that he was given to all manner of Cruelty, Wickedness and Injustice, which he exercised before and as soon as he was advanced to the Throne. Two Acts of his brutish Disposition he shewed to-

(89) *Nebo* or *Nabo* is *Mercurius*, *Asar* is *Mars*, and *Cbod* or *Cbad* is *Jupiter*. *Nabo* was the fourth *Arabian* King of *Babylon*, who was deified after his Death, and was the *Babylonian* Mercury, which Planet was called after his Name.

(90) See *Jos. Scalig.* Not. ad fragm. p. 15. fin. lib. de Emendat. temp.

(91) *Berosus* calls him *παῖδα*, sup. and *Xenophon* νεάνιστον, lib. v. p. 123.

(92) *Xenophon* lib. iv. p. 111, 112. lib. v. p. 123, 124, 139.

wards two of the principal Nobility, *Gobrias* and *Gadates*: the only Son of the first he slew at a Hunting, to which he had invited him, for no other Reason but that he had thrown his Dart with Success at a wild Bear and Lion, which he himself had (93) missed: and he caused the other to be castrated, only because one of his Concubines had commended him for an (94) handsome Man. These two Noblemen vowed Revenge for these Wrongs, which they soon after effected. It appears from *Xenophon's* History, that the Reign of this King of *Babylon* did not exceed a Year. For soon after the Defeat of the confederate Army under *Crasus* and his flying home, *Gobrias* the *Babylonian* revolted from the new King of *Babylon* to *Cyrus*, on account of the Cruelty towards his Son beforementioned: and not long after, *Gadates* revolted by his means, who was equally desirous of the Assistance of *Cyrus* to be revenged on the King of *Babylon* for the barbarous Usage of his Person. By the Encouragement of *Gobrias*, *Cyrus* entered into *Babylonia*; and having ravaged the Country drew up his Army before the Walls of *Babylon*, and challenged the *Babylonian* King to a single Combat; but he (95) refused to accept it. Then he marched to assist *Gadates*, beat the *Assyrian* Army, which was ravaging his Province, and forced the King of *Babylon* to retreat home after the Loss of a great Number of his Men: and having marched his Army again in Sight of *Babylon*, and taken three Fortresses on the Frontiers, between *Babylonia* and *Media*, he retired with all his Forces towards (96) *Media*. All this was done in the Summer and Autumn after the Death of *Neriglissar*. *Cyrus* having greatly enlarged his Army by the Accession of new Allies, and (97) Winter approaching, encamped in the most convenient Place for Forage, and concerted the Measures of the ensuing (98) Campaign.

The *Babylonian* King was not unactive on his Part: for he went

(93) *Xen. lib. iv. p. 112.*

(94) *Ibid. lib. v. p. 124.*

(95) *Ibid. p. 125, 126.*

(96) *Ibid. p. 129—141.*

(97) *Ibid. lib. vi. p. 150.*

(98) *Ibid. p. 151.*

into *Lydia* with a great Treasure to hire Troops and engage all the Nations of the *lesser Asia*, which were subject to *Cræsus* or his Allies, against *Cyrus* : and *Cyrus* was no less diligent in making Preparations to oppose him : and now *Abradatas* Prince of *Susa* came over to *Cyrus*, by means of his beautiful and heroical Wife *Panthea*, who being taken captive by *Cyrus* was generously (99) kept uncorrupted, and restored to him.

The confederate Army, which was engaged to assist the *Babylonian* Emperor against the *Medes*, chose *Cræsus* for their General. This Army consisted of *Thracians*, *Egyptians*, *Cyprians*, *Cilicians*, both the *Phrygians*, *Lycaonians*, *Paphlagonians*, *Cappadocians*, *Arabians*, *Phœnicians*, *Assyrians*, *Ionians*, *Æolians*, and almost all the *Greeks* of the *lesser Asia*, many of whom were Subjects of *Cræsus* (100), and the rest his Allies. All this vast Army was commanded by *Cræsus*, and assembled near the River *Pactolus*, where they wintered, in order early in the (1) Spring to march thence through *Cæle-Syria* to give the *Medes* Battle. *Cyrus* was prepared to receive them, and his Army was full of Spirit and eager to engage the Enemy : and being furnished with all Necessaries of War and Provision for twenty Days, marched with all Expedition to (2) meet and fight them. Assoon as the Armies were within a few Miles of each other they both immediately prepared for Action : and a bloody Engagement ensued, in which *Cyrus* obtained a compleat Victory. *Cræsus* fled to *Sardis* with Part of his *Lydian* Army ; and the Troops of the other Nations each made the best of their Way home ; and the *Assyrians* fled to (3) *Babylon*. *Cyrus* at Break of Day marched directly after *Cræsus* to *Sardis* and took it. *Cræsus* presently (4) surrendered himself, whom *Cyrus* treated with great Humanity and Kindness : and having reduced the *Greek* Nations who had been his Enemies, and left a strong Garrison of *Persians* at

(99) Xen. lib. vi. p. 155.

(100) Herodot. lib. i. c. 28.

(1) Ibid. c. 77. Xenoph. lib. vi. p. 158.

(2) Xenoph. lib. vi. fin.

(3) Herodot. lib. i. c. 190.

(4) Xenoph. lib. vii. p. 180, 181.

Sardis, he marched with his Army towards *Babylon*; and in his Way subdued the greater *Phrygia*, *Cappadocia*, and *Arabia*; and coming to *Babylon* surrounded it with a numerous Army, and rode round the Walls to see where a Breach might most easily be made: but finding it every where impregnable, thought at first to starve it by hindering any Provisions being carried into it. But finding that impossible, because the City had Provisions in it sufficient to supply it for (5) more than *twenty Years*: and being told that the River *Euphrates* ran through the midst of the City, he immediately ordered a Ditch to be made round the Walls on both Sides of the River, of sufficient Wideness and Depth to drain the Water of the River and make it fordable by being let into it. This Work being speedily done, *Cyrus* was informed that a public Festival was celebrating at *Babylon*, when the Inhabitants used to drink and revel all the Night: that Evening, as soon as it was dark, *Cyrus* employed a great Number of Men to open the Mouths of the Ditch towards the River, whereby the Water flowed into the Ditch, and the Channel of the River soon became fordable: and through it *Cyrus* marched his Army and took the City by Surprise in the Night; and the King himself was slain in his Palace by the Soldiers of *Gobrias* and *Gadates* (6).

It is evident from the foregoing History of *Xenophon*, that he supposed *Babylon* to be conquered by *Cyrus* the Year after the Death of *Neriglissar*. So that by his Account this young King, who was slain at *Babylon* in the first Year of his Reign, could not be the last King of *Babylon*, called *Nabonedus* by *Berosus*, and *Labynetus* by *Herodotus*, who reigned seventeen Years, as *Berosus* and the *Ptolemaic* Canon agree: and who was not slain at the taking of *Babylon* by *Cyrus*, but was by him made Præfect of the Province of *Carmania*, as we are assured by *Megasthenes* and *Berosus* from the *Chaldaean* Annals. Farther, *Babylon* was not taken by *Cyrus*, till the Year before *Christ* 536, but this King of *Babylon* was slain in the Year before *Christ* 553, and was succeeded by *Nabonedus*. Hence it appears, that *Xenophon's* last King of *Babylon*, who was slain in his Palace there, could by his Account be

(5) *Herodotus* saies they had Provision for very many Years, lib. i. c. 190.

(6) *Xen. Cyr. Institut.* lib. vii. p. 190—192. See *Herodot.* lib. i. c. 191.

no other than *Laborsoarchod*, the Son of *Neriglissar* and the *Belsazzar* of *Daniel*, who was slain in his Palace at a Feast. *Xenophon* therefore not being acquainted with the *Chaldean* Annals, has strangely confounded the *Babylonian* History, by an Error of seventeen Years, in taking the King who was slain in *Babylon* at a Festival for the last King of *Babylon* who was succeeded by *Cyrus*. *Xenophon* is also grossly mistaken, in making the *Lydian* War and the taking of *Sardes* and *Cræsus* in it, to have happened the same Year that *Babylon* was taken, and in the Spring precedent to it; whereas, if we place the Beginning of the Reign of *Cræsus* with the *Parian* Marbles, in the Year before *Christ* 556, which is the lowest Date of it, he by this Reckoning lost his Kingdom after he had reigned fourteen Years, in the Year before *Christ* 542, which was six Years before *Cyrus* took *Babylon*; and agrees with the Relation of *Herodotus*, who observes that (7) *Labynetus*, or *Nabonedus*, was then King of *Babylon*, as he really was, and reigned several Years after.

The Truth seems to be; *Xenophon* knew nothing of *Laborsoarchod*, and therefore supposed the Son of the King who was slain in Battle by *Cyrus* (and could be no other than *Neriglissar*) to be the last King of *Babylon*, *Nabonedus*, or *Nabonadius*: and also not knowing the Time of the Reign of the last King, he connected the History of *Cyrus* after the Death of *Neriglissar*, with the *Lydian* and last *Babylonian* War; and so fell into a Metachronism of seventeen Years. He might have had some confused Account, that the Son of that *Babylonian* King, who was slain in the War with the *Medes* when *Cyrus* commanded them, was soon after killed at a Feast in his Palace at *Babylon*: and knowing that *Babylon* was taken by *Cyrus* at the Time of a Festival, he thought that this King was then slain. However, it is certain that *Xenophon* is quite mistaken in his Relation; and that the Feast, when this King was killed in his Palace at *Babylon*, was not a general Festival, as that was when *Babylon* was taken by *Cyrus*; but only a Feast made by the King himself for a thousand of his Courtiers, or Grandees, as the Prophet *Daniel* relates in his vth Chapter and 1st Verse; nor does

(7) Herodot. lib. i. c. 77.

Daniel say or intimate, that *Babylon* was then taken. It is also certain, that when *Babylon* was taken by *Cyrus*, the reigning King *Nabonedus* was not slain; but having surrendered himself to *Cyrus*, was by him made Governor of *Carmania*, a Province of *Persia*, where he died.

The Error of *Xenophon*, whose History of *Cyrus* is more feigned than real, and agrees not with true Chronology, led *Josephus* to think, that *Belshazzar*, or *Baltasar*, was the last King of *Babylon*, whom he calls *Naboandel*, and who reigned when *Cyrus* took *Babylon*. And yet he knew that both *Megasthenes* and *Berosus* (whose History was taken from the *Chaldean* Records, and who were far better acquainted with the *Babylonian* History than *Xenophon* was) related that *Nabonadius*, the last King of *Babylon*, was not akin to *Nabuchadnezzar*, as *Belshazzar* undoubtedly was; but was a *Babylonian* Lord, who was in the Conspiracy with those who slew *Laborsoarchod*, the last of the Family of *Nabuchadnezzar*. Also that by their Account *Nabonadius* was not slain, but was made Governor of *Carmania* by *Cyrus*: whereas the Prophet *Daniel* saies, that *Belshazzar* was slain whilst he was feasting in his Palace at *Babylon*. And farther he relates, that upon the Death of *Belshazzar*, *Darius the Mede* took the Kingdom; whereas when *Babylon* was taken by *Cyrus*, the *Median* Empire had been destroyed by him about fourteen Years before, and the *Medes* were subject to the *Persians*: and so at the taking of *Babylon*, not *Darius the Mede*, but *Cyrus the Persian* took the Kingdom and destroyed the *Babylonian* Empire, and made it a Part of the *Persian* Monarchy. All this demonstrates that *Belshazzar* could not be *Nabonedus*, or *Nabonadius*, the last King of *Babylon*. *Josephus* seems sensible, that he was under a Difficulty in making *Belshazzar* the same with *Nabonedus*, who is called *Naboandel* in his Text; and therefore he does not say that at the taking of *Babylon* *Belshazzar* was slain, as the Prophet *Daniel* relates; but he saies, he was (8) taken with the City. But *Nabonedus* was not taken with the City or at *Babylon*, as he relates *Belshazzar* to have been, but fled from *Babylon* to *Borsippa*, a City of *Baby-*

(8) Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 11.

lonia, where being besieged by *Cyrus*, he surrendered himself into his Hands, as *Josephus* knew from (9) *Berosus*.

The Authority of *Xenophon* and *Josephus* hath misled both ancient and modern Chronologers, as *Africanus*, *Eusebius*, *Usher*, *Prideaux*, and others, who suppose *Belshazzar* to have been the last King of *Babylon*: and yet if the *Chaldaean* Records are to be credited, *Nabonedus* the last King of *Babylon* was a *Babylonian* Nobleman, and no way akin to *Nabuchadnezzar*; whereas *Belshazzar* was his Grandson, called by *Daniel* his Son, according to the usual Style of Scripture. The same Records attest, that *Nabonedus* at the taking of *Babylon* was not slain, and that he was made Governor of *Carmania* by *Cyrus*: but the Prophet *Daniel* saies, that *Belshazzar* was slain at *Babylon*, as before observed, and he was there at the very Time. Nor does *Daniel* either say or suppose that *Babylon* was then taken, or conquered by an Army; and much less by *Cyrus*: but only that upon the Death of *Belshazzar*, *Darius the Mede* took [the Administration of] the Kingdom. But had *Babylon* been then taken by the Arms of *Cyrus*, no doubt but so signal an Event as the Overthrow of that great City and Kingdom, which was so much the Subject of the Prophecies of *Isaiab* and *Jeremiab*, *Isai.* ch. xiii, xiv, xxi, xliii, xlv, xlvii. *Jer.* xxv, l, li. *Hab.* ch. ii. would have been mentioned, and *Cyrus* been particularly named. It is therefore very plain, that *Belshazzar* was not the last King of *Babylon*, nor slain when that City was taken by *Cyrus*; but that he was slain by his Courtiers, or Lords, at a Feast, to which he had invited them: and that he was no other than *Laborosarchod*, the last of the Family of *Nabuchadnezzar*, being his Grandson by his Daughter, who was married to *Neriglissar*, and slain by his Courtiers, as *Berosus* and *Megasthenes* wrote from the *Chaldaean* Annals; and as *Daniel* relates concerning *Belshazzar*.

By the Death of *Belshazzar* were fulfilled the Prophecies of *Isaiab* and *Jeremiab*, concerning the Family of *Nabuchadnezzar*. *Isaiab* foretold, ch. xiv. 22. that *God* would cut off from *Babylon* the Name and Remnant, the Son and Nephew, or Grandson, or, as it may be

(9) Lib. i. cont. Apion. p. 452.

better rendered, *the Son and Posterity*. This was literally fulfilled by the Death of *Evil-Merodach*, Son of *Nabuchadnezzar*, who was slain by *Neriglissar* who had married his Sister : and by the Death of *Laborosarchod*, or *Belsazzar*, the Grandson of *Nabuchadnezzar* by his Daughter, who was killed by his Lords in his Palace at a Feast. *Jeremiab* foretold ch. xxvii. 7. *All Nations shall serve him* [*Nabuchadnezzar*] *and his Son, and his Son's Son, until the very Time of his Land come* : that is, until it be subject to another Kingdom, according to *Daniel's* Interpretation of the Hand-writing, ch. v. 28. that *the Kingdom* (of *Babylon*) *was to be divided, or broken, and given to the Medes and Persians*. But it is to be observed, that the Prophecy of *Jeremiab* was not in (10) *Jerome's* Copy of the Septuagint Greek Version ; nor is to be found in any Greek Copy except the *Complute* : but *Theodoret* cites it in his Comment.

It is proper to take notice of a miraculous Circumstance which preceded the Death of *Belsazzar*, as it is related in the vth Chapter of the Book of *Daniel*. Whilst he and his Lords, his Wives and Concubines, were drinking at a Feast in the sacred Vessels of the *Jewish* Temple, and praising their Idols of Gold, *etc.* above the God of *Israel*, who had so signally punished his Grandfather *Nabuchadnezzar* for the Pride of his Heart ; and whose just Judgment he confessed, and glorified him as the only true God : whilst *Belsazzar* was thus exalting his Idols above the Lord of Heaven, and shewing his Contempt of the true God, he saw the Appearance of the Fingers of a Man's Hand come out of the Wall, and write upon the Plaister over-against the Lamp which was burning before him, some Words, which being wrote in the (11) *Hebrew Letters*, none of his wife Men could read or interpret them : but *Daniel* being sent for told the King, that the Hand-writing was a Message from that God whom he had dishonoured, to acquaint him that his Kingdom was at an End, and would be broken and given to the *Medes and Persians*. And

(10) Comment. in loc.

(11) The ancient *Hebrew* Letters were the same with the *Samaritan*, and different from the *Chaldee* Letters, as I have before proved at large ; and this was the Reason that the *Chaldeans*, and wise Men of *Babylon*, could not read the Hand-writing. See El. Sched. de Dis German. p. 182, 183.

in that very Night *Belshazzar* was slain, and *Darius the Mede* took the Kingdom.

Belshazzar, or *Laborosoarchod*, was slain in the Year before Christ 553, and *Darius the Mede* took the Kingdom. *Josephus*, from *Xenophon*, thought this *Darius the Mede* to be the Son of *Astyages*, called by *Xenophon* *Cyaxares*. But no ancient Historian, or Greek Writer, besides *Xenophon*, whose Credit is questioned by (12) *Plato* and *Cicero*, appears to have known any thing of this *Cyaxares*: and all agree that *Astyages* was the last King of the *Medes*, who was dethroned by *Cyrus*, and succeeded by him in the *Median* Kingdom. So that we may conclude, that the second *Cyaxares* is a merely fictitious King, and that *Darius the Mede* was another Person. (13) *Herodotus* saies, that *Astyages* left no Son; and (14) *Ctesias* agreed with *Herodotus*, that *Astyages* was not succeeded in the *Median* Kingdom by a Son, but was conquered and deprived of his Kingdom by *Cyrus*: nor does even *Xenophon* say, that *Cyaxares* ever reigned at *Babylon*, or had any Power there. So that by even *Xenophon's* Account, *Cyaxares* could not be *Darius the Mede*, who took the Kingdom of *Babylon*. The ancient Jewish History of *Bel and the Dragon*, § 1. saies, that *Cyrus* succeeded *Astyages*. And (15) *Æschylus*, in his Tragedy called *Perseæ*, makes *Cyrus* the third King inclusive from that King of the *Medes* who took *Susa* and conquered *Persia*; and he was *Cyaxares* the Father of *Astyages*: and so *Cyrus* must succeed *Astyages* in the *Median* and *Persian* Kingdoms, and no Room is left for another *Cyaxares* between them. *Phraortes* the Father of *Cyaxares* conquered most of *Persia*, but not *Susa*; and lost all again, and was beaten and killed by the King of (16) *Assyria*. But his Son *Cyaxares* both recovered what his Father had lost, and added the Conquest of *Susiana* to *Persia*; and afterward destroyed the *Assyrian* Empire, and so ruled, as the Poet

(12) Plat. de Leg. lib. iii. Cicer. epist. ad Quintum Frat.

(13) Ασπάρχης μὲν ἐστὶ γέγονν ἢ ἀπαις ἔργον γόνυ. lib. i. c. 109. See Just. Hist. lib. i. c. 4.

(14) Excerpt. Phot. ad fin. Herodot.

(15) Edit. Steph. p. 162.

(16) Herodot. lib. i. c. 102, 103.

said, over all (the upper) *Asia*. *Cyrus* was the third from him; but must be the fourth, if we add *Xenophon's* *Cyaxares* Son of *Astyages*. *Dionysius* (17) of *Halicarnassus* said, that the *Median* Kingdom was destroyed under the fourth King: the four Kings were *Dejoces*, *Phraortes*, *Cyaxares*, *Astyages*; so he knew nothing of the second *Cyaxares*. *Dion* (18) in his *Persic* History related, that *Cyrus* made War upon *Astyages*. *Diadorus Siculus* said (19), that *Cyrus* conquered and deposed *Astyages*, and subjected the *Medes* to the *Persians*. (20) *Plato* and *Aristotle* (21) agree in the same Relation; and so does (22) *Strabo*, and others; and with them *Africanus* (23), *Eusebius*, and all the ancient *Christian* Writers, except those who follow *Xenophon*. Lastly, it is foretold by the Prophet *Jeremiah*, ch. xxv. 25. that the *Median* Kingdom should be subdued before the Fall of the *Babylonian* Empire, predicted *Jer* 26. But this was not true, if *Cyaxares* Son of *Astyages* was King of *Media* when *Babylon* was taken by *Cyrus*: and it is certain, that the *Medes* were never conquered unless by *Cyrus*, when he dethroned *Astyages*; and all Historians agree, that this was several Years before his taking of *Babylon*, as *Herodotus* relates, and as it was foretold by the Prophet. It is therefore clear and undoubted, that the *Cyaxares* of *Xenophon* was not *Darius the Mede*, or King of *Media*, who took Possession of the *Babylonian* Kingdom upon the Death of *Belshazzar*. And had he been King of *Babylon*, though but for two Years, as is supposed; he must have been in the *Ptolemaic* Canon if he reigned at *Babylon*, or a *Satrapa*, or *Viceroy*, appointed by him.

(17) *Antiq. Rom.* lib. i. p. 2.

(18) *Apud Athen. Deipnosoph.* lib. xiv. p. 633.

(19) *Lib. ii.* p. 148. *lib. xiii.* p. 558. excerpt. de *Virtut. et Vitiis*, p. 553.

(20) His Words are; ὁ μὲν πρῶτος Κύρος ἐλάβηκε Πέρσας τὰς αὐτῆς πολι-
τας τῷ αὐτῷ Οὐρανίῳ αἶμα καὶ τὰς δεσπότης Μήδους ἐδουλόσατο καὶ τῆς ἄλλης Ἀσίας μέ-
χως Αἰγύπτου ἤρξεν. *Menexenus*, p. 519.

(21) Ὁ μὲν Κύρος, ὡς πάντες ἴσασιν, καὶ αἱ ἰσχυραὶ μαρτυρίαι, παραλαβὼν τὰς
Πέρσας τοῖς Μήδοις δὴτεν λαβρόντας, τέτταρτον δὲ δούλον δεσπότης τῶν πρὶν αὐτὸν δου-
λευσάντων κατέστη καὶ πᾶσαν ἔσθλ' ἐκείναι ἤρχον ἀρχὴν ὑποχείμενον ἐποίησε τοῖς αὐτοῖς.
De Repub. lib. ix. p. 489. See his *Polit.* lib. v. p. 405.

(22) *Geog.* lib. xi. p. 795.

(23) *Chron.* lib. poster. p. 126. *Chron. Pasch.* p. 142. *Syncel. Chronog.*
p. 235.

So that it is a Demonstration, that there never was any such King of *Media* or *Babylon* as *Cyaxares*, who reigned in either of these Kingdoms between *Astyages* and *Cyrus*. But it still remains to be considered and ascertained, who was the King called *Darius the Mede*.

Africanus and *Eusebius* thought *Belshazzar* to have been the last King of *Babylon*, and *Astyages* to be *Darius the Mede*, who took the Kingdom at his Death; and to be also *Nabonedus*, who was dethroned by *Cyrus*. Therefore (24) *Eusebius* mentions no *Babylonian* King after *Belshazzar*; but saies, that after him the *Chaldaean* Kingdom was transferred to the *Medes* and *Perfians*, which he places in the twenty-seventh Year of the Reign of *Astyages*, who held it twelve Years, and then was dethroned by *Cyrus*. By this Account *Eusebius* must take *Darius the Mede* to be *Astyages*, and the same also with *Nabonedus*: and instead of the seventeen Years of *Nabonedus*, he gives the twelve last Years of *Astyages*, whom he makes to reign thirty-eight Years, instead of thirty-five, the true Number, to bring the first of *Cyrus* to the first Year of the 55th Olympiad. But these are small Liberties in Comparison of others which *Eusebius* takes. This Account of *Eusebius* is a fatal Error in Chronology. For by supposing *Babylon* to be taken, and the *Chaldaean* Kingdom to be destroyed by *Astyages*, twelve Years before *Cyrus* began to reign in *Perfia*, he contradicts all History, which unanimously ascribes to *Cyrus* the taking of *Babylon*, and putting an End to that Kingdom, and carries the Epoch of the Destruction of it thirty-six Years too high. And in consequence of these Errors he falls into others, and is forced to place the Reign of *Cyrus* over *Babylon*, and over the *Medes* and *Perfians*, in the same Year, when he conquered and dethroned *Astyages*: and by this Reckoning, he made it impossible that the *seventy* Years Captivity of the *Jews* should end in the first Year of *Cyrus*, or rather the second, according to the Relation of the Scripture, which by his Account were but *fifty* Years. However, it was the general Sense of the ancient *Christian* Writers, after *Africanus* and *Eusebius*, that *Astyages* was

(24) Chron. lib. poster. p. 126.

Darius the Mede, whom the *Babylonians* called *Nabonedus*, or *Nabonadius*. Syncellus (25) saies, that *Darius the Mede* was *Astyages* the eighth King of the *Medes*, reckoning amongst them four Præfects from *Arbaces*, and he calls him (26) *Darius Astyages*, and makes *Darius*, *Astyages*, and *Nabonedus*, the same King. And in his Copy of the (27) astronomical Canon *Nabonadius* is called *Astyages*; and in the old ecclesiastical Canon he is called *Nabonadius*, *Astyages*, and *Darius Son of Assuerus*.

Two of our great modern Chronologers, *Scaliger* and *Petavius*, though they differ in many Things, agree that *Laborsoarchod* was the *Belshazzar* of *Daniel*, in which they are right: but then they both suppose *Nabonadius*, who succeeded him, and whom *Herodotus* calls *Labyntus*, to be (28) *Darius the Mede*: in which Opinion they are certainly mistaken. For *Berosus*, cited above, tells us, that *Nabonadius*, or *Nabonedus*, was a *Babylonian*, as his Name also shews, being compounded of *Nabo*, a *Babylonian* God, and *Adon* signifying *Lord*; and therefore he could not be *Darius*, who was a *Mede*, and of the *Seed* royal of the *Medes*, and also King of *Media*, as is evident from

(25) Chronograph. p. 205.

(26) Ibid. p. 223, 227, 231.

(27) Ibid. ubi sup. p. 208, 209. *Constantine Manasses*, in his poetical Annals, saies, *Darius the Mede* was the Greek *Astyages*, who came with an Army to *Babylon*, and slew *Baltasar*, and made the Kingdom tributary to the *Medes*: and that soon after the *Median* Kingdom itself was destroyed by *Cyrus*. This is the most accurate Account.

Μεῖα μακρὸν ὁ Μῆδ' ὅδε Δαρεῖ' ἐπελάσας
 Μεῖα πολλῆς δυνάμεως ὃν φασιν Ἀσυσγὴν
 Παῖδες ἐβλήων Περσικὰς γαστέρας ἰσορίας,
 Κατέκτετε τὸν ὑπέροφρον Βασιλέα τὸν Χαλδαῖον,
 Καὶ Βαβυλῶν' ἐκαμψέ τὴν σκληρὴν ἐραχλίαν,
 Καὶ Μηδικῆς ὑπόφερον ἐποίησεν ἰχθυῖν.
 Καὶ ὅθεν ἐκυρίωσαν οἱ Μῆδοι τῆς Ἀσίας.
 Ἄλλ' ἔδ' αὐτοῖς παρέμενει ἄχρι πολλῶν ἡλίων

Τὸ πρότερον τὸ βασίλειον, ἀλλ' ἀπερύει θάπτον. p. 29, 30.

(28) See *Scaliger's* Animadv. in Euseb. p. 91. Emendat. Temp. lib. vi. p. 580—583. Fragm. p. 15, 20, 22. Prolegom. p. 33, 34. Petav. Doctrin. Temp. lib. x. c. 9, 10. Rational. temp. lib. ii. part i. p. 67.

the

the vith Chapter of *Daniel*. *Herodotus*, who calls him *Labynetus*, makes him King only of *Babylon* when *Astyages* was King of the *Medes*: but these learned Chronologers suppose *Astyages* to be deprived of the *Median* Kingdom by *Cyrus*, before *Nabonadius* took the Kingdom of *Babylon*. And further, they suppose *Darius the Mede* to rule over the *Babylonian* Kingdom only; whereas *Daniel* speaks of *Darius the Mede*, who took the Kingdom of *Babylon*, as being the then reigning King of the *Medes*; which Kingdom was then divided into an hundred and twenty (29) *Satrapies*, or Provinces, over which *Darius* set so many Princes, or Presidents, and over these three principal Governors, of which *Daniel* was first, or chief, *Dan.* vi. 1, 2. And that this was the *Median* Kingdom is evident, because it was governed by the *Laws of the Medes and Persians*, *ŷ* 8, 12, 15. But it is absurd to suppose, *Nabonadius* a *Babylonian*, who lived and reigned at *Babylon* only, to govern that Kingdom by the *Laws of the Medes and Persians*, and not by those of the *Babylonians*, whose Customs and Language

(29) The 120 *Satrapies* [σατραπείαι as the *Greek* Version calls them] were Governors of so many Provinces: but afterwards under the *Persian* Empire several Provinces made one *Satrapy*. Therefore *Herodotus* saies, that the Government of the *Babylonian* Territory was the Principal of all the *Satrapies*, as the *Persians* call them, ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς χώρης ταύτης [i. e. βαβυλωνίης] τὴν οἱ Πέρσαι Σατραπείῃ καλέουσι, ἔστι ἀπασῶν τῶν ἀρχέων πολλὴν τι κρατίστη. lib. i. c. 192. A *Satrapa* was therefore a *Persic* Word, which the *Chaldeans* expressed by [ܐܚܨܕܪܦܢ] *Ahsdarpân*, or *Achasdarpan*. See *Hyde's Hist. relig. vet. Pers.* p. 321. and *Hesyc. Lex. voc.* Σατραπείαι. These 120 Provinces were 127 in the Reigns of *Darius* Son of *Hystaspes*, and of *Artaxerxes*, 1 *Esd.* c. iii. 2. *Esther* c. i. 1. *Darius* threw them into twenty *Satrapies*, several Provinces being united and taxed together in one *Satrapy*; all which *Herodotus* particularly describes, lib. iii. c. 89—94. But still the Provinces continued distinct and had distinct Governors, though several of them made one *Satrapy*. These *Satrapies* were usually given to the Brothers and younger Sons of the *Persian* Kings, and they had a Power over the provincial Governors: but that they might not misuse their Power, and the King might not be defrauded in his Revenue, nor the Provincials or the People be oppressed by them, the Kings of *Persia* appointed annual Superintendants, to enquire into and inspect the Conduct of the *Satrapas*; and to give an Account to the King of their Behaviour. See *Briffon. de regn. Pers.* lib. i. p. 241—246.

were

were very different from those of the *Medes and Persians*. Nor was the *Babylonian* Kingdom alone of sufficient Extent to contain 120 Provinces, or *Satrapies*; for the *Persian* Monarchy, when it was at the Height of its Greatness in the Reign of *Artaxerxes*, and comprehended the *Assyrian*, *Babylonian*, *Median*, and *Egyptian* Kingdoms under it, contained no more than 127 Provinces, or *Satrapies*, *Eftb.* ch. i. 1. But to put the Matter out of all Doubt, who *Darius the Mede* really was, he is called, *Dan.* ch. ix. 1. *the Son of Assuerus* (30) *of the Seed of the Medes*. Now we are told by the ancient Author of *Tobit's* History, that *Tobias* his Son, *before he died, beard of the Destruction of Nineveh, which was taken by Nabuchodonosor and Assuerus*, ch. xiv. 15. This *Assuerus* was *Cyaxares* King of *Media*, and Father of *Astyages*, who, as that most accurate and faithful Historian *Herodotus* tells us [with whom all Historians agree] took and destroyed *Nineveh*, and with it the *Assyrian* Kingdom; but yielded the *Babylonian* Kingdom, which was then subject to the *Assyrians*, to *Nabuchodonosor*, the Father of *Nabuchadnezzar*, who had revolted from the King of *Assyria*, and assisted *Assuerus* or *Cyaxares* in the War and taking of *Nineveh*. Hence it appears, with the highest Probability, and even historical Demonstration, that *Astyages* is *Darius the Mede*, who took the Kingdom of *Babylon* into his Hands upon the Death of *Belsazzar*. *Astyages* was Heir to *Belsazzar*, who was the Grandson of his Sister, who was married to *Nabuchadnezzar*: and he had also an ancient Claim to the Kingdom of *Babylon*, as being a Part of the *Assyrian* Empire now subject to *Media*, since the Family was extinct, which had reigned in it ever since it was separated from the *Assyrian* Empire.

It is easy to suppose, that in the Confusion which must ensue upon the Slaughter of *Belsazzar*, *Astyages*, who would soon hear of it, and was the most powerful Monarch of *Asia*, and had lately been at

(30) *Abasuerus* in the *Hebrew* is *אבשור* *Achsuarus*, or *Axyarus*. To which if we add *Ky*, *Cy*, *Xa*, or *Scba*, which signified *Lord* or *King*, it is then with the *Greek* Termination *es*, instead of *us*, *Cyaxares*, or *Lord*, or *King Axares*. And it is known that *Astyages* was the Son of *Cyaxares*, or *Cy-Axares*.

War with the *Babylonians*, would seize upon the Government, and not suffer a new King to be chosen without his Consent: and the *Babylonians* would be afraid to act without his Approbation. Therefore *Nabonadius*, a *Babylonian* Lord or Prince, and one of the Conspirators against *Belshazzar*, was elected King by the Nobles of *Babylon*, and confirmed in the Kingdom by *Darius* or *Astyages*, who made him tributary. He reigned seventeen Years in *Babylon*, and then was conquered and deposed by *Cyrus*, in the Year before *Christ* 536.

The Account which I have given reconciles the *Babylonian* Annals of *Megasthenes* and *Berosus*, and the History of *Herodotus*, and all other ancient Writers concerning *Astyages*, with the sacred Relation of the Prophet *Daniel*. The Confusion of all other Accounts both of ancient and modern Chronologers has been owing to *Africanus* and *Eusebius* making the Beginning of the Reign of *Cyrus* in *Persia* to commence with the dethroning *Astyages* and the Destruction of the *Median* Kingdom. By this Reckoning *Astyages* could not reign at the Death of *Belshazzar*. But it appears from the Reigns of *Ctesias*, when placed at their true Epoch, that *Astyages* reigned to the Year before *Christ* 552, which was one Year after the Death of *Belshazzar*; and *Cyrus* had then reigned in *Persia* five Years, [and according to the vulgar and *Eusebian* Chronology eight Years] but as *Astyages* reigned two Years later, and three Years after taking the Kingdom of *Babylon*, as may be inferred from *Daniel* having a Vision in the *third* Year of his Reign, ch. viii. *Cyrus* must have reigned seven Years before he took the *Median* Kingdom from *Astyages*. The ancient Chronologers, whom *Eusebius* consulted, agreed that *Cræsus* did not reign in *Lydia* more than two Years before *Cyrus* reigned in *Persia*: and they agreed also, that *Cyrus* did not conquer *Astyages* and destroy the *Median* Kingdom, till the eleventh Year of *Cræsus* and ninth of *Cyrus*; where *Eusebius* (31) himself places *Cræsus* consulting the Oracles about making War with *Cyrus* for his taking the *Median* Kingdom from *Astyages*. And therefore, to have been consistent, he ought to have placed the Destruction of the *Median* Kingdom in the ninth of *Cyrus*, and not in the first of *Cyrus*. This

(31) Chron. lib. poster. p. 127.

shews that *Eusebius* is guilty of a gross Error of eight Years : and it is evident from *Herodotus*, that *Astyages* was not conquered by *Cyrus* till the eleventh Year of *Cræsus*, which was in the Year before *Christ* 550; if we place the Beginning of his Reign in the Year before *Christ* 560, which is as high as it can be placed; if he reigned no more than two Years before *Cyrus*, as *Eusebius* himself placeth him : for it is certain that *Cyrus* did not reign till the Year (32) before *Christ* 557, having reigned thirty Years, when he died in the Year before *Christ* 527, and *Eusebius* has placed him three Years too high.

Other learned (33) Writers have thought that *Belsazzar* was the same King with *Evil-Merodach*, because he is called the Son of *Nabuchadnezzar* both in *Daniel* and *Baruch*; and they make *Neriglissar*, who slew *Evil-Merodach*, to be *Darius the Mede*. But this Opinion is wholly inconsistent with the Relation of *Daniel*, that the *Babylonian* Kingdom was broken and ended at the Death of *Belsazzar*, and was thenceforth to be subject to the *Medes*: for under *Neriglissar* [who was a *Babylonian* and not a *Mede*] and his Son *Laborsoarchod* it continued an independent Kingdom, as it was foretold by *Isaiab*, ch. xiv. 22. and *Jerem.* ch. xxvii. 7. 2 *Chron.* xxxvi. 20. viz. that the *Jews* and all the Nations conquered by *Nabuchadnezzar* should serve him, his Son, and his Son's Son. But, according to these learned Writers, the *Chaldean* Kingdom was transferred to the *Medes* after the Death of the Son of *Nabuchadnezzar*: whereas, according to the Prophecies, it was to end and be transferred to the *Medes* after the Death of the Son's Son, or the Grandson of *Nabuchadnezzar*, and therefore it could not end in *Evil-Merodach*, as it is plain from the *Chaldean* History it did not; but it truly ended in *Laborsoarchod* the Grandson of *Nabuchadnezzar*, as we are assured from the Testimonies of *Megasthenes* and *Berosus*, no one of *Nabuchadnezzar's* Family ever after reigning at *Babylon*: and the

(32) The *Parian Marbles* fix the Reign of *Cræsus* to the Year before *Christ* 556, by which Reckoning *Cyrus* began to reign a Year before him, and four Years before him according to the *Eusebian* Chronology. But I think it more probable that *Cræsus* began to reign in the Year before *Christ* 560, and two Years later than *Eusebius* has placed his Reign.

(33) See *Universal History*, p. 968—972.

Kingdom

Kingdom thenceforth was subject and tributary to the *Medes*. Therefore *Belshazzar* can be no other than *Laborsoarchod* the Grandson of *Nabuchadnezzar*, who, according to the Style of Scripture, is called his (34) Son; and *Darius the Mede* could be no other than *Astyages* King of the *Medes and Persians*, under whom *Nabonedus* governed the Kingdom of *Babylon* as a tributary King, in the same manner that *Cyrus* was King of *Persia*, but subject and tributary to the *Medes*. The *Belshazzar* mentioned in *Baruch*, ch. i. 11. was *Evil-Merodach*; and *Laborsoarchod* was not then born: but when he came to the Throne he took the Name of *Belshazzar*, which his Uncle had before.

Chronologers have run into Mistakes about *Darius the Mede* by not knowing that it was a common Name of the *Median* Kings, and afterwards of the *Persian*. The *Apostolic Constitutions*, so called, style *Cyaxares* the Father of *Astyages*, who was King of the *Medes* in the Time of *Judith*, by the (35) Name of *Darius*: and *Jerome* (36) calls him by the same Name: and *Suidas* saies, that *Thales* (37) foretold an Eclipse of the Sun in the Reign of *Darius*, by whom he must either mean *Cyaxares* or *Astyages*. *Darius* was a Name denoting (38) *Power* and *Prowess*, as *Xerxes* was. And that there was an older *Darius* than him who was the Father of *Xerxes*, we are informed by the old

(34) *Laban* is called the Son of *Nabor*, Gen. xxix. 5. yet he was his Grandson, Gen. xxii. 20—23. *Gera* and *Ared* are called the Sons of *Benjamin*, Gen. xlv. 21. but they were his Grandsons, 1 Chron. viii. 1, 2, 3. *Achan* is called the Son of *Zerah*, Jos. vii. 24. yet he was his great Grandson, as appears from v. 18. In like manner Grandfathers and Grandmothers are called Fathers and Mothers: so *Reuel* is called the Father of *Zipporah* and her Sisters, Exod. ii. 18. yet *Jetbro*, who is also called *Hobab*, was her Father, Exod. iii. 1. ch. iv. 18. ch. xviii. 1, etc. and *Hobab*, who is called the Father-in-Law of *Moses*, is called the Son of *Reuel*, Numb. x. 29. See *Judg.* iv. 11. In 1 Kings xv. 10. *Maachab* is called the Mother of *Asha*; and yet she was his Grandmother, and is called the Mother of his Father *Abijam*, 1 Kings xv. 2.

(35) Lib. viii. c. 2.

(36) *Scythas* (dicit) sub *Dario* rege *Medorum* orientem tenuisse captivum. This King was *Cyaxares*, as *Herodotus* assures us.

(37) Θαλῆς ὅτι Δαρείω προειπὼν τὴν τῆ ἡλίου ἐκλειψιν, in voc. Θαλῆς.

(38) *Herodot.* lib. vi. c. 98.

Scholiast (39) of *Aristophanes*, who saies the Money (40) called *Darics*, was so named from an older *Darius* than the Father of *Xerxes*.

I shall only add, that as the Canon of *Ptolemy*, and the Remains of *Megasthenes* and *Berosus*, have enabled us to clear up the Succession of the Kings of *Babylon*, without which the Scripture Prophecies and History concerning them could not have been explained; so for Want of knowing this Succession *Herodotus* was led into the Mistake, that the last King of *Babylon*, *Nabonedus*, whom he calls (41) *Labynetus*,

(39) Εἰς μὲν χρυσοὶ σάηρες οἱ Δαρικοί — ἐκ δὲ Δαρείου τὸ Ἑρξεν παλῶς, ἀλλ' αἰφ' ἑτέρου τινὸς παλαιότερου βασιλέως ἀνομασίθησαν, Schol. in *Aristoph.* *Ecclef.* γ' 598. Suid. voce *Δαρικός*, and Harpocrat. Lex. in voc.

(40) If the Money called *Darics* was so called from a King *Darius*, it probably had the Name from *Darius Cyaxares*, the Father of *Astyages*, who, after taking of *Nineveh*, might coin Money out of the Gold found there, and call it *Darics* after his own Name. But I am more inclined to think the *Daric* was an ancient *Assyrian* or *Babylonian* Coin called in *Chaldee* *Adarkon*. It is mentioned in *Ezra* viii. 27. where it is rendered in the *Greek* Version χρυσοὶ, i. e. Staters, which in Weight were two Drachms: and this was the Weight of the *Daric*: and therefore *Herodotus* calls them σάηρων Δαρικῶν, lib. vii. p. 396. because they were equal to the *Attic* golden Stater of two Drachms Weight. The *Adarkonim* are also again rendered χρυσοὶ, or Staters, in 1 *Chron.* xxix. 7. and *Josephus* there interprets the Word by σάηρες, lib. vii. c. 14. p. 410. So that the *Adarkon* and *Daric* being of the same Value and Weight, it is probable the *Greek* Δαρικός, *Daric*, was formed from the *Chaldee* *Aderkon*, the initial *A* being omitted. This Money was stamped with the Effigies of an *Archer*, as *Plutarch* tells us, vit. *Artax.* Mnem. p. 1021. See Sir *I. Newton's* Chronol. p. 319, 320. The *Darkmon* or *Drachmon* was but half the Value of the *Adarkon*; and the *Greek* δρεχμή, Drachm, was derived from it; and accordingly in *Ezra* ii. 69. the *Alexandrian* Copy of the *Greek* Version renders *Drachmonim* by δρεχμαίς, which is the true Interpretation. As these Words are only used by *Ezra* (who is thought to have wrote the *Book of Chronicles*, where *Adarkonim* in the plural Number is found) and *Nebemiab*, it is probable they took them from the *Chaldee* Language, which they understood.

(41) The Difference between *Labynetus* and *Nabonedus* chiefly consists in putting *L* in the Beginning for *N*, which was usual amongst the Ancients. Thus *Ælian* Var. Hist. lib. xii. c. 42. calls *Cyrus* the Son of *Mandale* instead of *Mandane*. And *Festus* derives *Lympha* from the *Greek* νύμφη, *Nympha*. So likewise in *Daniel* *Psanterin* is from the *Greek* ψαλτήριον, *Psalterium*, Dan. iii. 5, 7. In like manner *Herodotus* calls *Nabonedus*, *Labynetus*.

was the Son of *Nabuchadnezzar*, (who is his elder (42) *Labynetus*, and whose Queen was *Nitocris*) who inherited, he saies, the Name of his Father with the Kingdom of *Assyria* : so he calls the Kingdom of (43) *Babylon*. *Herodotus* knew nothing of the successive Reigns of *Evil-Merodach*, *Neriglissar*, and *Laborsarchod* ; and so made *Nabonedus* succeed *Nabuchadnezzar* : but as the three intervening Reigns were short, their Times made no Alteration in his History.

Astyages having taken the Kingdom of *Babylon* upon the Death of *Belshazzar*, confirmed the Choice which the Nobility had made of *Nabonedus*, and left him to rule there under him. But *Astyages* carried with him to (44) *Ecbatana* the Prophet *Daniel*, so much famed for his Wisdom and Knowledge, and made him the prime Minister of his whole Kingdom, which was divided into an hundred and twenty Provinces. The most probable Reason of the high Advancement of *Daniel* in the *Median* Kingdom, where he was a Stranger, was, that *Astyages* was made acquainted, that he was the Person who had interpreted the divine and miraculous Sign which was given to *Belshazzar*, and by which *Daniel* foretold that his Kingdom should be taken from him and given to the *Medes* and *Persians*, for which Interpretation, though fatal to *Belshazzar*, yet he, according to his Promise, made him the third Ruler in his Kingdom, ch. v. 29. This Advancement of a Stranger, who was also a Captive and of another Religion, raised the Envy and Spite of the other Presidents and Princes, before whom he was preferred in the Favour of the King : and by an envious and malicious Confederacy and Accusation made against him to *Astyages*, under a Pretence of his contemning the royal Authority, he was thrown into a Den of Lions, and miraculously preserved from being devoured by them ; and his Deliverance proved the Destruction of his Enemies, as is related in the sixth Chapter of his Book. After this

(42) Herodot. lib. i. c. 187, 188.

(43) Xenophon frequently calls the *Babylonians* by the Name of *Assyrians* ; and the King of *Babylon* King of the *Assyrians*, Institut. Cyr. p. 22, etc. See Strab. Geog. lib. xvi. init. and Plin. Hist. Nat. lib. vi. c. 26. Herodot. lib. i. c. 177, 188.

(44) Jos. Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 11.

Daniel was most highly esteemed by *Astyages*, and had the chief Management of the Affairs of his Kingdom, all the Remainder of his Reign.

In the first Year of the Reign of *Darius the Mede*, or *Astyages*, over *Babylon*, *Daniel* had the Vision of the (45) four great Empires represented by four great Beasts, ch. vii. These were the *Babylonian*, *Medo-Perfian*, *Greek* and *Roman* Empires. And in the same Year he had the Revelation of the *seventy Weeks*, ch. ix. And in the third Year of his Reign he had the Vision of the *Ram* and *He-Goat*, etc. ch. viii.

After *Astyages* had reigned two Years from the Time of his taking the Kingdom of *Babylon*, *Cyrus* being grown famous in Arms, and greatly admired and beloved by the *Perfians*, over whom he reigned, though they were subject to the *Medes* (46), persuaded them to revolt from *Astyages*, who was very cruel and tyrannical: other (47) Nations followed the Example of the *Perfians*, and they agreed to make *Cyrus* their General; and at the second Battle with the *Medes* he entirely defeated them (48) at *Pasargadae* in *Persia*, and *Astyages* was taken (49) Prisoner.

Isocrates (50) writes that *Cyrus* slew *Astyages* after he had conquered him: but *Herodotus*, *Ctesias* and others agree that he only deprived him of his Kingdom but not of his Life. *Herodotus* saies that he kept him with him Prisoner; but *Ctesias* related that he made him (51) Governor of *Barcania*.

(45) See above p. 365, 366. The Paschal Chronicle placeth the Vision of ch. vii. in the first Year of *Darius the Mede*: and that of ch. viii. in the third Year, p. 141. and the Epitome of the Chronicon of *Eusebius* placeth the Vision of the four Beasts, ch. vii. in the first Year of *Darius*, p. 144.

(46) *Herodot.* l. i. c. 126, 127, 130. *Polyæn.* *Stratag.* lib. vii. p. 615, 616. *Diod. Sic.* lib. xiii. p. 558.

(47) *Diod. Sic.* ubi sup. from an ancient Testimony, which he cites.

(48) *Strab. Geog.* lib. xv. p. 1062.

(49) *Herodot.* lib. i. c. 127, 128, 129.

(50) *Orat.* in *Evag.* p. 337.

(51) *Ctes.* Excerpt. ad fin. *Herodot.* p. 639, 684. *Justin* saies that *Cyrus* made *Astyages* Governor of the *Hyracians*: eum maximæ genti Hyrc-

When

When *Astyages* was conquered and dethroned, an End was put to the *Median* Empire, the Kings of which had ruled over the *Upper Asia* beyond the River *Halys*, from the Death of *Dejoces* to the End of the Reign of *Astyages*, for ninety-seven or ninety-eight Years, excepting the Time of the *Scythian* Invasion and Tyranny (52).

Cyrus had reigned in *Persia* under the *Medes* seven Years from the Year before *Christ* 557, before he revolted from the *Medes* and conquered *Astyages* in the Year before *Christ* 550. And in this Year or the Year before *Eusebius* ought to have placed the Destruction of the *Median* Empire; because he himself places in this Year the War between *Cræsus* and *Cyrus*, which commenced upon the dethroning of *Astyages*, who had married the Sister of *Cræsus*, as *Herodotus* relates. That which deceived *Eusebius* was, that he thought the Reign of *Cyrus* in *Persia* commenced with the Destruction of the *Median* Empire, and therefore he placed them together in the first Year of the fifty-fifth Olympiad, which was the Year before *Christ* 560. But *Cyrus* had reigned in *Persia* from the Death of his Father *Cambyſes*; and ſeveral Years during the Reign of *Astyages*, though he reigned over the *Medes* only from the Time of his Conquest of *Astyages*: this not being conſidered, cauſed an Error of ten Years in the *Eusebian* Chronology of the Reign of *Astyages*, which is placed ſo many Years too high that it might end with the firſt of *Cyrus* in *Persia*. And this Error

norum præpoſuit; nam in Medos reverti ipſe noluit, lib. i. c. 6. fin. *Barcania*, where *Cteſias* ſaies he was Governor, adjoined to *Hyrkania*. See *Stephan.* voce Βαρχάνιοι.

(52) *Herodotus*, as his preſent Text has it, lib. i. c. 130. reckons the Time of the *Median* Kingdom over the *Upper Asia* to be an hundred and twenty-eight Years, [ἔτεα τεσάρηκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν δύο καὶ δύο]. But as he expreſſly ſaies, c. 101. that the firſt *Median* King *Dejoces* ruled only over *Media*, and the Reigns of the other three amounting to no more than ninety-seven Years, the Word τεσάρηκοντα ſeems plainly to be an Interpolation in the Text of *Herodotus*, and that he computed the Times of the *Median* Kings over the *Upper Asia* to be [ἔτεα ἑκατὸν δύο καὶ δύο] ninety-eight Years. If the fifty-three Years of *Dejoces* be added to the ninety-seven Years of the three following Kings, the *Median* Kingdom ſtood an hundred and fifty Years, by the Computation of *Herodotus*. And this may be the right Number of *Juſtin*, lib. i. c. 6. fin. where inſtead of regnaverunt (Medi) annos ccccl. it ſhould be cl. and the Number ccccl. muſt be an Error.

being

being corrected, it is evident that *Astyages* must be *Darius the Mede* and King of *Media*, who took the *Chaldean* Kingdom upon the Death of *Belshazzar* in the Year before *Christ* 553, and reigned three Years after to the Year before *Christ* 550. This is a very important Point of Chronology, which has never yet been understood, but is now, I hope, cleared up to the Satisfaction of the learned Reader.

Cræsus succeeded his Father *Halyattes* in the *Lydian* Kingdom about the Year before *Christ* 560, and increased it greatly by the Conquest of the (53) *Cilicians*, *Lycians*, *Phrygians*, *Myrians*, *Mariandyns*, *Chalybes*, *Paphlagonians*, *Thracians*, *Thynians*, *Bitbynians*, *Carians*, *Ionians*, *Dorians*, *Æolians*, *Pamphylians*. And when *Cyrus* had dethroned and taken *Astyages* captive, and *Cræsus* found the *Persian* Kingdom was growing great and powerful; having consulted several Oracles, by whose ambiguous Answers he was imposed upon, he thought they encouraged him to make War against the *Persians*, which he was beforehand disposed to do, both to curb the growing Greatness of that Empire, and to be revenged on *Cyrus* for dethroning *Astyages*. He began the War with invading (54) *Cappadocia*. He took and plundered the City *Pteria*, and ravaged the Country thereabout, where *Cyrus* came up with him and fought him. But though he had the greater Number of Troops, the *Lydians* fought so bravely that the Armies were forced, Night coming on, to part without either Side obtaining a Victory. The next Day, *Cyrus* not renewing the Battle, *Cræsus* returned with his Army of *Lydians* to *Sardis*, intending to fall upon the *Persians* in the Beginning of the Spring; and to be joined with a numerous confederate Army of *Egyptians* and *Babylonians*, whose Kings *Amasis* and *Labyntus*, or *Nabonedus*, he had engaged in Alliance with him; he also ordered the *Lacedæmonians*, his Allies, to join him at an appointed Time; and they were all to rendezvous at (55) *Sardis* in the (56) *fifth Month*.

(53) Herodot. lib. i. c. 28.

(54) Ibid. c. 46, 71, 73, 76.

(55) Ibid. c. 76, 77.

(56) Ibid. c. 77. The Rendezvous was to be about the Beginning of *February*, because the *Asiatics* began the Year in Autumn.

In the mean time *Cræsus* not suspecting that *Cyrus* would venture to follow him to *Sardis* at that Time of the Year, Winter approaching, dismissed all his hired Troops. *Cyrus*, being informed of what he had done, resolved not to lose the Opportunity, but immediately marched with his Army into *Lydia*. Upon this *Cræsus* got together all the *Lydians* he could; and the two Armies met and engaged in a large Plain near *Sardis*. The *Lydians* being chiefly Horse, *Cyrus* brought his Camels against them, which as soon as the Horses saw and smelt, they fell into Disorder, and would not stand: the *Lydians*, perceiving what occasioned the Fright of their Horses, immediately dismounted and fought the *Persians* on Foot: and after a great Slaughter on both Sides, the *Lydians* being overpowered, fled into *Sardis*, where *Cyrus* immediately shut them up by a close Siege (57).

Cræsus being shut up in *Sardis* sent to all his Allies for Succours; but *Cyrus* pushed the Siege on so vigorously that in fourteen Days he took the City and *Cræsus* in it (58).

Thus *Cyrus*, by the Conquest of *Cræsus*, after he had reigned fourteen Years, and taking *Sardis*, became Master of the *Lydian* Kingdom, which was now added to the great *Persian* Empire. *Cyrus* took *Sardis* in the Year before Christ 546, and four Years after he had conquered the *Medes*.

Several Nations of the *Upper* and *Lower Asia*, which had been tributary to the *Medes*; and others of the *Lesser Asia*, who had been subject to *Cræsus* (59), revolted from *Cyrus*. The chief of these were the *Babylonians*, who from the Time of *Astyages*, being conquered and losing the *Median* Kingdom, shook off their Dependency on *Media*, and *Nabonedus*, or *Nabonadius*, their King ruled in his own sole Right, and assisted *Cræsus* in the War against *Cyrus*. These Revolts

(57) Herodot. lib. i. c. 76, 77, 79, 80. Polyæn. Stratagem. lib. vii. sect. 6. p. 614, 615.

(58) Herodot. ibid. c. 81, 83, 84.

(59) Herodot. lib. i. c. 142—176. Civitates quæ Medorum tributariæ fuerant, mutato imperio, etiam conditionem suam mutatam arbitantes a Cyro defecerunt: quæ res multorum bellorum Cyro causa et origo fuit, Justin. lib. i. c. 7.

were the Occasion of many Wars for the Space of fourteen Years. *Cyrus* therefore divided his Forces into two great Armies; one of which he commanded in Person, and subdued all the *Upper Asia*; whilst *Harpagus* with the other reduced all the (60) *Lower* and *Lesser Asia*: after this, to complete his Conquests and to be Master of all *Asia*, he made

(60) Τα μὲν νῦν κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίας Ἀρπαγὸς ἀνάσταλα ἐποίησε· τὰ δὲ ἄνω αὐτῷ, αὐτὸς Κύρος πᾶν ἔθνος κατὰσχεφόμενος, καὶ ἔθεν παλαιάς.—Κύρος δὲ ἐπέτε τα πάντα τὰ ἐπείρου ὑποχείρια ἐποίησατο, Λαυρῶσισι ἐπέβητο, Herodot. lib. i. c. 177. *Larissa*, (probably the old *Resen*) a large and strong City of *Assyria*, situated upon the *Tigris*, was one which refused to submit to the *Persians*, after they had destroyed the *Median* Empire, and held out a long Time against them. *Xenophon* found it desolate and in Ruins when his *Greeks* came thither in their *Asiatic* Expedition. He was told that the King of *Persia* (at what Time the *Persians* had conquered the *Median* Empire) having laid Siege to this City could by no means take it; but the Sun covering itself with a Cloud disappeared, till the Men (who defended it) left it; and thus it was taken, *Ex-pedit. lib. iii. p. 308. edit. Francof. 1596.* The Words are; Ταύτῃ [Λαυρῶσι] βασιλῆς ὁ Περσῶν, ὅτε οὐδὲ Μήδων ἐλάμβανον τῇ ἀρχῇ Πέρσαι, πολιορκῶν ἔθεν τρέπον ἐδυνάτο ἐλεῖν· ἤλιος δὲ νεφέλῃ προκαλύψας ἠφάνισε, μέχρις οἱ ἀνθρώποι ἐξέλιπον καὶ ἔτις ἐάλω. As it is not probable that a mere Cloud darkening the Sun, should frighten the Inhabitants of *Larissa* to desert a strong Town, which they had long defended against the Forces of *Cyrus*; so this Terror, which made them leave the City to the Enemy, seems more likely to have been occasioned by a sudden total Eclipse of the Sun, which entirely darkened it for some time. The learned Mr. *Costard* has found by Calculation, that in the Year before *Christ* 547, which was three Years after the Conquest of *Astyages*, and when *Cyrus* was reducing the revolting States of the *Upper Asia*, there happened a total Eclipse of the Sun *October* the twenty-second in the Afternoon at *Larissa*. This was probably the Cloud which darkened the City, and made the Soldiers and Inhabitants desert it. If this was so, the Time is fixed with great Certainty when this great and populous City was reduced and taken by *Cyrus*. This was in the fourth Year of *Cyrus* over the *Median* Empire. This Eclipse seems verified from what *Xenophon* relates immediately after, concerning a very large and strong-walled City, called *Mespila*, which was six Parasangs or about twenty-two Miles distant from *Larissa*. Hither the Queen of *Astyages* was reported to have fled after the *Persians* had subdued the *Medes*: and *Cyrus* besieged it a long Time, and was not able to take it by Force; but *Jupiter* (as *Xenophon* was told) ἐμβροχῆτας ποιεῖ τὰς ἐνοικῶντας καὶ ἔτις ἐάλω, *ibid. p. 309. put the Citizens into a Consternation, and so the Town was taken.* What could occasion this Consternation so probably as a total Eclipse of the Sun, (which they might interpret to denote the Anger of *Jupiter*, who was their great God the Sun)

WAR

War upon the *Babylonians*. In this Expedition he had a numerous Army of *Persians*, *Armenians*, *Medes*, *Phrygians*, etc. *Jerem.* li. 27. well provided with all Necessaries ; and marched towards *Babylon*. When he came to the River *Gyndes*, which was in his Way, he found it not passable. And one of his white Horses, which was consecrated to the Sun, having been drowned in endeavouring to pass the River, *Cyrus* in a Rage threatened Revenge upon it ; and employed his whole Army to cut it into three hundred and sixty Channels, by which he rendered it almost dry. This Work took up a good deal of Time. After this, in the Beginning of the following Spring, he marched directly to *Babylon*. The *Babylonians* having drawn out their Army waited his coming ; and fought him as he approached near the City : and being beaten fled into it. And as it was provided to hold out many Years, they made a Jest of being besieged. *Cyrus* having laid a long Time before *Babylon* to no purpose, at last took it by a Stratagem. He cut a Channel through the great Bank which was made by *Nitocris* between the River *Euphrates* and a great Lake which was deep and wide enough to receive the Water of it ; and in the Night-time turned the Water of the River through the Canal into the Lake, so that the Channel was fordable : and whilst the *Babylonians* were all dancing and revelling on Occasion of a Festival, and perceived nothing of the Matter, the *Persians* waded up to the Thighs through the Channel of the River, both where it run in and out of the City ; and the Gates being left open, they entered at both Ends and took it by Surprise (61).

Thus *Babylon* was taken in the Year before *Christ* 536, and in the twenty-second Year of the Reign of *Cyrus*.

If the Festival celebrated at *Babylon* when it was taken by *Cyrus*, was that called *Sacea*, as seems probable, then we can fix very nearly the Day of the Month upon which it was taken. This Festival began

whose Shadow passed over this City as well as *Larissa*, and frightened the Inhabitants into a Surrender ? These two Cities therefore were taken in the Year before *Christ* 547.

(61) Herodot. lib. i. c. 189, 190, 191. Polyæn. Stratagem. lib. vii. p. 616.

on the sixteenth Day of the Month *Lous*; and so fell in *August*, and continued five Days, as (62) *Berosus* acquaints us. At this Time all manner of Excess in Eating and Drinking, and Lewdness, was allowed. And as the whole City was in Disorder at the Time of this Festival, it is not to be wondered that the Gates of the City were neither shut nor guarded; and so, that *Cyrus* having rendered the Channel of the River fordable, easily marched through it with his Troops into the Town and took it. (63) *Herodotus* observes very remarkably, that *Babylon* was so large a City, that *when both Ends of it were taken, they who lived in the middle Parts knew nothing of it*. This agrees in a surprising manner with the Prophecy of *Jeremy*, concerning the taking of *Babylon*, who saies, *One Post shall run to meet another, and one Messenger to meet another, to shew the King of Babylon that his City is taken at the End* (or in the Extremities of it) *and that the Passages* (both into and out of the City) *are stopped*, ch. li. 31, 32. And that it should be taken at the Time of a *Festival*, whilst the Inhabitants were revel-

(62) Βήρωσθ' ἐν πρώτῃ Βαβυλωνιακῶν τῇ Λῶω Φησι μηνὶ ἐκκαδεκάτῃ ἄγεσθ' ἐρεῖν Σακίαν προσπαγορεύομένην ἐν Βαβυλῶνι ἐπὶ ἡμέρας πέντε, ἐν αἷς ἔθ' ἐῖναι ἄρχεσθ' τὰς δεσπότας ὑπὸ τῶν οἰκῶν, ἀφηγεῖσθαι τε τῆς οἰκίας ἕνα αὐτῶν ἐνδεδυκότα σολὴν ὁμοίαν τῇ βασιλικῇ, ὃν καλεῖσθ' Ζωγάνην· μνημονεύει τῆς ἐρεῖης καὶ Κλησίας, etc. Ap. Athenæi Deipnos. lib. xiv. p. 639. See *Casaubon's* Animadversions upon this Feast, p. 574. and *Strab. Geog.* lib. xi. p. 780. and *Eustath. Comment. in Hom. Il. P.* p. 1131. But they all mistake in the Etymology of the Name, deriving it from the *Sacæ*; whereas it was denominated from *Sakia*, *compotatio*, as *Dr. Hyde* shews, *Hist. Relig. vet. Persar.* p. 269. See also *Selden de Diis Syr. Syntag.* ii. c. 13. It was an ancient *Babylonian* Festival, far older than *Cyrus*: and *Strabo's* Account of its Institution by *Cyrus*, after the Slaughter of the *Sacæ*, is fabulous. See *Scalig. Not. in Fragm.* p. 18. ad fin. lib. de Emendat. tempor.

(63) Ὅτι δὲ μεγάλῃ τῆς πόλεως, ὡς λέγεται ὑπὸ τῶν ταύτῃ οἰκημένων, τῶν ἐξ ἑαυτῆς πόλεως ἐαλωκότων, τὰς τὸ μέσον οἰκίας τῶν Βαβυλωνίων ἔμειναν ἐαλωκότας· ἀλλὰ (τυχὴν γὰρ σφί ἐξσαν ὁρῆν) χορεύον τε τῶτον τὸν χρόνον, καὶ ἐν ἀποθείῃσι εἶναι, ἐς ὃ δὴ καὶ τὸ κατέλειπτο. lib. i. c. 191. what *Herodotus* calls τὰ ἑαυτῆς [τῆς πόλεως] is, as it were, a Translation of *קטס Katse* in *Jeremy*, which is rendered *ἑαυτῶν* by the LXX Interpreters. *Aristotle* writes, that it was related that when *Babylon* was taken, one Part of the City did not know it till the third Day after it was taken. Τοιαύτη δὲ ἴσως ἐστὶ καὶ Βαβυλῶν—ἥς γε φασὶ ἐαλωκίας τρίτην ἡμέραν ἔκ αἰσθῆσθαι τι μέρος τῆς πόλεως. *Repub.* lib. iii. c. 3.

ling

ling and drinking, the same Prophet foretold in these Words; *In their Heat I will make their Feasts, and I will make them drunken, that they may rejoice and sleep a perpetual Sleep, and not wake, saith the Lord, & 39, 57, 58.* It was also foretold, that the River *Euphrates* should be made dry, to facilitate the taking of it: *A Drought is upon her Waters, and they shall be dried up, Jerem. ch. l. 38.* And that the Army which besieged it should be *Medes and Persians*, is plainly foretold by *Isaiah*. *Behold* (saies he, foretelling the Fall of *Babylon*) *I will stir up the Medes against them.* And again, *Go up, O Elam, besiege, O Media, ch. xiii. 17. xxi. 2.* And that besides these, the *Armenians*, and *Phrygian Horsemen*, were to be employed in the taking of *Babylon*, is foretold by *Jeremy*, ch. li. 27, 28. in these Words, *Set ye up a Standard in the Land, blow the Trumpet amongst the Nations, prepare the Nations against her (Babylon :) Call together against her the Kingdoms of Ararat, Minni (64), and Ashchenaz: appoint a Captain against her; cause the Horses to come up against her, as the rough Caterpillars (this is the true Sense) prepare against her the Nations with the Kings of the Medes. Ararat and Minni are the Countries of the greater and lesser Armenia, as the Chaldee Paraphrase and Syriac Version explain them: and as Bochart has shewn in the first Book and third Chapter of his sacred Geography. And that Ashchenaz is the lesser Phrygia, the same learned Author has proved in the third Book and ninth Chapter of the same Work. And (65) Xenophon relates, that Cyrus having conquered Cræsus, and reduced Lydia, sent Hystaspes with an Army against Phrygia, bordering on the Hellespont, i. e. the lesser Phrygia; who took Captive the King of it, and carried away with him in his Army a great Number of Phrygian Horsemen, etc. These Cyrus took with his other Troops in his Expedition against Babylon.*

(64) The Word *Minni* may not signify a Country, but *from me*: it is therefore omitted in the *Armenian* Version; and *Armenia* is the Kingdom of *Ararat*, according to the Exposition of *Moses Chorenensis*, Hist. Armen. lib. i. c. 21. and agreeably hereto, the *Alexandrian* Copy of the *Greek* Version renders *Minni* by *παρ' ἐμῆς*.

(65) Institut. Cyr. lib. vii. p. 187.

Hero-

Herodotus saies nothing of what happened to the King of *Babylon*, when the City was taken. *Berosus* saies he fled to *Borsippa*, which was a strong City of *Chaldæa* (66), where being besieged by *Cyrus*, he surrendered himself into his Hands, who used him with great Clemency, and made him Governor of the Province of *Carmania* in *Persia*, where he spent the Remainder of his Days and died. *Berosus* (67) saies, he fled with *a very few Men* after his Defeat by *Cyrus*. And it seems from the Words of the Prophet, that he fled out of the City, upon the News brought him by several Messengers that the *Persians* were entered into both Ends of it.

I have shewn above, that *Cyrus* took *Babylon* in the Year before *Christ* 536, and probably in the Month of *August*.

In the Summer of the next Year, and in the first Year of his Reign at *Babylon*, and in the Year before *Christ* 535, *Cyrus* published a Decree from his Palace at (68) *Ecbatana* in *Media* (where it was afterwards found and confirmed by *Darius*) which gave the *Jews* Liberty to return to *Jerusalem*, and to build their Temple, *Ezr.* ch. i. 1, 3. This Decree was procured, as is most probable, by the Prophet *Daniel*, who was at *Ecbatana*; and shewed *Cyrus*, or read to him, the Prophecies of *Isaiab* and *Jeremiab*, declaring that he should be the Conqueror of the *Babylonian* Kingdom; and the Deliverer of God's People from their seventy Years Captivity. This was foretold by *Isaiab*, ch. xlv. 28. ch. xlv. 1, 2, 13. and by *Jeremiab*, ch. xxv. 12. xxix. 10. These Prophecies were made known (69) to *Cyrus*, as appears from his Proclamation, in which he saies, that *the Lord God of Heaven had given him all the Kingdoms of the Earth, and charged him to build him an House in Jerusalem, which is in Judah*, *Ezr.* ch. i. 2. All which is expressly and plainly foretold by *Isaiab*, in the Places above-cited. This Decree, which was proclaimed throughout all the *Persian* Kingdom, was in the 70th Year of the *Jewish* Captivity; and

(66) *Strab.* Geog. lib. xvi. p. 1074. *Stephan.* in voc.

(67) *Ap.* *Joseph.* cont. *Apion.* lib. i. p. 452.

(68) *Ezr.* vi. 2. where the vulgate *Latin* Version has *in Ecbatanis*; and the Context confirms that Reading; and also 1 *Esd.* ch. vi. 23.

(69) See *Joseph.* *Antiq. Jud.* lib. xi. c. 1.

the 70 Years were fully completed, when the *Jews* returned and began to build their Temple, in the (70) second Year of the Reign of *Cyrus*, and in the Beginning of the Year before *Christ* 534. For if we count from the first Year of *Nabuchadnezzar*, which was the Year before *Christ* 604, when he first invaded *Judæa*, and carried away many *Jews* captive to *Babylon*, to the Year before *Christ* 534, when they returned to *Jerusalem* and began to build their Temple, we shall find the Term to be exactly seventy Years: though their Captivity was properly at an End in the 70th Year, and in the first of *Cyrus*, when his Decree for their Return was proclaimed.

The ancient *Christian* Chronologers, *Africanus*, *Eusebius*, and others, were not able to account for these seventy Years, from the first of *Nabuchadnezzar* to the first of *Cyrus*; as not knowing the Times of the *Chaldean* Kings nor the Epoch of them; nor that *Cyrus* reigned in *Persia* several Years before he conquered the *Medes*, and several more after that before he took *Babylon*. So that the first Year of the Reign of *Cyrus* in *Persia* could not, as they supposed, be the first Year of his Reign at *Babylon*, when he proclaimed Liberty to the *Jews* to return to *Jerusalem*. *Eusebius* saw, that by his Computation it was no more than fifty Years from the third of *Eliakim*, or *Jeboiakim* (where he places *Nabuchadnezzar's* Conquest of *Judæa* and making *Eliakim* tributary) to the first Year of the Reign of *Cyrus* in *Persia*: and therefore he (71) observes, that some reckoned the 70 Years Captivity of the *Jews* to be completed in the twentieth Year of *Cyrus*. But how this was to be reconciled to the Scripture, declaring that *Cyrus*, in the first

(70) See Joseph. cont. Apion. lib. i. p. 452. and Theophil. ad Autolyc. lib. iii. fin. The Religion of *Cyrus* (who was a *Magian*, and hated the Idolatry of Image-Worship, and worshiped the Sun as the God and Lord of Heaven represented by a perpetual Fire) disposed him in a peculiar Manner, both to destroy the *Babylonian* Idols, and to release the *Jews*: for 'tis observable, that in his Decree for their Return, he commanded, that the House of the Lord in *Jerusalem* should be built again, where they do sacrifice with continual Fire, 1 *Ezdr.* vi. 24. See Briffon. de regn. Pers. p. 351—356.

(71) Chron. lib. poster. p. 128.

Year of his Reign, proclaimed Liberty for the *Jews* to return to *Judæa*, and build their Temple in *Jerusalem*, he knew not: for, as hath been observed, he, with *Africanus*, supposed the first Year of *Cyrus* over *Persia* and *Babylon* to be the same: and as the Chronologers agreed, that *Cyrus* began to reign in *Persia* in the first Year of the 55th Olympiad, he places the last of *Astyages*, the first of *Cyrus* in *Persia*, and the End of the *Jewish* Captivity, all in the same Year, or in the Year before *Christ* 560, which was impossible. On the other hand, it is certain, that *Cyrus* had reigned in *Persia* twenty-one Years before he conquered *Babylon* and the *Chaldaean* Kingdom, and had it in his Power to release the *Jews* from their Captivity: and that he ruled also in *Persia* several Years during the Reign of *Astyages* over the *Medes*, to whom he was subject, before he conquered him: and that after *Astyages* was conquered, and the *Median* Kingdom destroyed, a King continued to reign at *Babylon* several Years, who was called *Nabonedus*, or *Nabonadius*: and that after *Cyrus* had conquered him, and added the *Chaldaean* Kingdom to the *Persian* Empire, he reigned no more than nine Years over *Babylon*. So that *Cyrus* had two Beginnings of his Reign, one in *Persia* and the other in *Babylon*, the latter of which was twenty-one Years after the first: and his last nine Years Reign at *Babylon* are ascertained by the *Ptolemaic* Canon. But *Africanus* and *Eusebius* not knowing this, confounded the two Epochs of his Reign, which were twenty-one Years distant from each other: and so *Eusebius* finding the seventy Years Captivity by no means to agree to his first of *Cyrus*, understood these Years to mean the Desolation of the Temple, from the burning of it in the eleventh of *Zedekiah*, to the re-building of it in the second Year of *Darius* Son of *Hystaspes*, and made the Captivity continue no more than fifty Years. This is evident from (72) comparing what he saies together. But *Africanus*, as *Eusebius*

(72) *Hebræorum* captivitas et exterminium Templi quod fuit in *Jerusalem*, annis LXX. qui supputantur usque in secundum annum *Darii*. *Chron. lib. poster. p. 125.* Remissio quidem captivitatis *Judæorum* et venia templi ædificandi sub *Cyro* exordium habuit: sed consummatur templum sub *Dario*. *ibid. p. 129.*

intimates, began the Reckoning of the seventy Years Captivity from the thirteenth Year of the Reign of *Josiah*, and the Beginning of *Jeremy's* prophesying to the first of *Cyrus*. For Historians, he said (73), agreed to connect the Beginning of *Cyrus* with the End of the *Jewish* Captivity; and of this Beginning he knew no other Date than the first Year of the 55th Olympiad, or the Year before *Christ* 560, which was the Beginning of his Reign in *Persia*, as *Diodorus Siculus*, *Tballus*, *Castor*, *Polybius*, *Pblegon*, and other Historians and Chronologers, who reckoned by the Olympiads, agreed. By this it is probable, that *Africanus* reckoned from the thirteenth of *Josiah*, and the first of *Jeremy's* Prophefying, which was about seventy Years, and he might reckon it exactly so much. This *Eusebius* (74) mentions to have been the Opinion of some whom he names not. But it is impossible that either of these Calculations should be true. For as the *Jews* were neither Captives, nor any way subject to the *Babylonians*, in the Reign of *Josiah*, their Captivity could not be reckoned from any Year of his Reign: and as they were restored to their Liberty and their Country, with Leave to build their Temple, by a Decree in the first Year of *Cyrus*, it was very absurd to suppose their Captivity not to end till eighteen Years after in the second of *Darius*. But the true Epoch of the Reign of *Cyrus* at *Babylon* being known, all is easy and clear; and the *Jewish* Captivity of seventy Years, foretold by the Prophets, ended very exactly as the Scripture relates, in the first of *Cyrus*, over the Kingdom of *Babylon*. This important Point being fully proved and settled, I have brought this Part of my Chronological Antiquities as low as I intended. But the Astronomical Canon of *Ptolemy* being frequently mentioned in these Papers, I shall subjoin a Dissertation concerning it, and add it with some other Things relating to the foregoing Work.

(73) Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. x. c. 10.

(74) Colligitur omne tempus captivitatis Judæorum anni LXX. qui secundum quosdam a tertio anno Eliakim, usque ad vicesimum annum Cyri Regis Persarum computantur: porro secundum alios a Josiæ Judæorum anno XIII. sub quo Jeremias prophetare cœpit, usque ad primum annum supra dicti regis. Desolationis vero templi sub Dario rege complentur anni LXX. Chron. lib. poster. p. 128.

OF THE
Æ R A of N A B O N A S A R ;
AND THE
Astronomical Canon of P T O L E M Y of *Pelusium*.

THIS Æra took its Beginning at *Babylon* from *Nabonasar*, who reigned there under the King of *Assyria*; and seems to be the first who had the Title of King after *Babylon* was made a Province of the *Assyrian* Empire, from the Time of *Ninus* who conquered it.

This Æra commenced on the twenty-sixth Day of *February*, which was then the *Tboth*, or Beginning of the *Egyptian* Year; and with the first Year of the Reign of *Nabonasar*, as (1) *Censorinus* assures us; and nearly 747 Years before the vulgar *Christian* Æra.

That it commenced on the twenty-sixth Day of *February* is certain, from the Account of *Censorinus*. For he saies, that in the Year of

(1) Quidam anni in literas relati sunt, quos Nabonnazaru nominant, quod a primo imperii ejus anno confurgunt, quorum hic DCCCCCLXXXV. which is the true Reading, and not DCCCCCLXXXVI. De Die Natali, c. 21. In this Chapter *Censorinus* fixes several other famous Æras, computed to the Year of his writing, in the Consulship of *Ulpianus* and *Pontianus*, which was in the Year of *Christ* 238. Therefore he fixes the Olympiads to the Year before *Christ* 776. The Building of *Rome* to the Year before *Christ* 753. The Æra of the Year of *Julius Cæsar* to the Year before *Christ* 45. The *Egyptian* Æra Augustorum to the Year before *Christ* 29. And the Æra of *Philip*, from the Death of *Alexander the Great* to the Year before *Christ* 324.

Christ 238, when he wrote his excellent Book, the *Thoth* was at the seventh of the Calends of *July*, that is, the twenty-fifth of *June*. Now from the Beginning of the Reign of *Nabonasar*, in the Year before *Christ* 747, to the Year of *Christ* 238, there are 984 Years [so *Censorinus* reckoned the Time of his writing to be in the 985th Year of *Nabonasar*, and not the 986th, as his present Text has it] in which Space of Time the *Thoth* being gone back 246 Days, began on the 26th Day of *February*, and was gone back to the 25th Day of *June*, or to the seventh of the Calends of *July*.

Ptolemy, in his Astronomical Canon, computes from the Epoch of the *Nabonafarean* Æra, by the *Egyptian* Year of 365 Days, without any Intercalation of the odd Quarter of a Day. And so the Beginning of the Year, called the *Thoth*, from the first Month of the *Egyptian* Year so named, goes back a Day in the Space of four Years; and in 1460 Years it has a Retrogradation of an entire Year: and then it begins again on the same Day of the Month from which it commenced at first. So that 1461 *Egyptian* Years make 1460 *Julian* Years.

The Method of the *Ptolemaic* Canon is, by our learned modern Chronologers, thought to be, to set down the Number of Years of the Reign of each King, from the first *Thoth*, or Beginning of the Year in which he reigned, to the *Thoth* which fell in the last Year of his Reign: and every King is said to have reigned so many Years as there were *Thoths* in his Reign: and if a King died ever so soon after the *Thoth*, or Beginning of the Year, all that Year was reckoned to his Reign (which was the Method of the *Chinese* Annals) and if at any Time it happened, that any succeeding King did not reign to the End of the Year, or to the next *Thoth* which fell after the Death of the preceding King, his Name was not mentioned in the Canon. This is supposed to be the Case of several Kings, who not reigning to the *Thoth*, or Beginning of the Year after the precedent Reign, their Names are not set down in the Canon. But that this is a Mistake of our learned Chronologers, (2) *Prideaux*, and others, will appear presently.

(2) *Connect.* Part i. B. ii. p. 161.

This *Nabonasæan* Æra was used by the ancient Astronomers, both amongst the *Chaldeans* and *Greeks*, as *Claudius Ptolemy* assures us, in his astronomical Works. It was universally esteemed to be the most accurate Chronological Computation of all others, most Part of it being fixed by Eclipses and celestial Observations, which were much cultivated and improved from the Time of that Æra. It contained a Term of 424 *Egyptian* Years, from (3) *Nabonasar* to the Death of *Alexander the Great*; and was thence carried down from the *Egyptian* and *Roman* Annals, to the Reign of *Antoninus Pius*.

Learned Men have been at a Loss to know the Author, or Publisher of the Astronomical Canon to the Death of *Alexander the Great*. Mr. *Dodwell* (4) thinks *Berosus* was the Author of it. But there is no sufficient Evidence of this. *Berosus* mentioned in his History *Laborosoarchod*, a *Babylonian* King; and very probably other Kings, who are not set down in the Canon; and whose Names he took from the Archives of the Temple of *Belus* in *Babylon*. But the Truth seems to be, that *Claudius Ptolemy* himself composed the whole Canon; and took the Years from *Nabonasar* to *Alexander* out of the *Chaldean* History, and probably that of *Berosus*: and the Remainder from the *Egyptian* Annals, and the *Greek* and *Roman* Historians. The old *Egyptians*, *Chaldeans*, and *Phœnicians*, in their Annals, and also the *Greek* and *Roman* Writers, in their Histories, set down both the Years and odd Months of the Reigns of Kings; and always the Reigns which were less than a Year; and one Reign began where the preceding ended. But *Ptolemy*, by a peculiar Fancy of his own, made the Years of every Reign complete, and left out those Reigns which were less than a Year; by which sometimes he lost a Year. This is evident in the omitted Reigns of *Galba*, *Otho*, and *Vitellius*, which make a Year and six Months and fourteen Days; and yet he allows but four Months and two Days for these Reigns, which he adds to the Reign of

(3) Ap. Syncel. Chronograph. p. 206.

(4) Berosum itaque nostri Canonis primum editorem fuisse diximus. Appen. ad Differt. Cyp. Sect. 26. p. 39. also Sect. 30. See also ibid. p. 35. 36.

Nero. For *Nero* reigned thirteen Years, seven Months, and twenty-eight Days; and he gives no more than fourteen Years between the Beginning of his Reign and that of *Vespasian*. There is an Omission of a Year between *Neriglissar* and *Nabonadius*. *Berosus* gave four Years to *Neriglissar*, and also nine Months to his Son *Laborsoarchod*, who is omitted by *Ptolemy* because he did not reign a Year; and yet *Ptolemy* gives no more than four Years to both Reigns; unless the Number was five, as it is in the Copy of *Syncellus*, and which is the true Number of these Reigns. There seems also to be an Error of a Year or more by the Omission of the Reigns of *Artabanus*, who reigned seven Months, and of *Xerxes* the second, and *Sogdianus*, whose two Reigns made nine Months according to *Manetho*, and eight Months according to other Historians: for all which, making fifteen or sixteen Months, nothing is allowed, if the Numbers in *Manetho* are right, in respect to the Reigns of *Xerxes*, *Artaxerxes*, and *Darius* the second, which are the same in *Manetho* as in the *Ptolemaic* Canon, besides the Months of the three Kings being added also. But I am inclined to think, that the Times of these three omitted Reigns were by *Ptolemy* included in the Reigns of *Xerxes* and *Artaxerxes*.

Africanus, in digesting the Dynasties of *Manetho*, followed the Method of *Ptolemy*, in leaving out all the odd Months which were in the several Reigns of the *Egyptian* Kings who reigned any Number of Years; and made the Reigns consist of entire Years: but he set down the odd Months of those Reigns which were less than a Year, because he would not omit the Names of the Kings, as *Ptolemy's* Canon does. This was the Method of the *Jewish* Historians. That *Africanus* left out the odd Months which exceeded the Years is evident from two Dynasties set down in *Josephus*, viz. the seventeenth and eighteenth; wherein the odd Months are set down from *Manetho* as well as the Years.

Ptolemy was to blame in omitting to set down the Names of the Kings who reigned less than a Year; and *Africanus* did right to set them all down in the *Egyptian* Dynasties: and it would have been still better if he had not omitted the odd Months of any Reigns, but had given us the Reigns entire as *Josephus* did in those he has recorded.

By reckoning the Sums of every Dynasty in entire Years he probably misreckoned now and then a Year one Way or the other.

Had *Ptolemy*, as is thought by *Prideaux* and others, computed the Years of Reigns always by the Number of *Tbotbs* which were in them, he could not have omitted all the three Reigns of *Galba*, *Otho*, and *Vitellius*; because, according to his reckoning by the *Æra Augustorum*, which began *August* the thirty-first in the Year before *Christ* 30, there was a *Tbotb* in the Reign of *Galba*, who reigned from *June* the ninth to *January* the fifteenth; and another in the Reign of *Vitellius*, who reigned from *April* the sixteenth eight Months and five Days to *December* the twentieth. So that both *Galba* and *Vitellius* reigned in the Month of *August*, in which the *Tbotb* was in their Reigns. Therefore *Ptolemy's* Rule seems plainly to have been, to leave out all the Reigns which consisted of Months only and were less than a Year, without regarding whether there was a *Tbotb* in them or not; and supplying them by Additions to other Reigns, and so to make all the Reigns consist of entire Years: which in the whole he did, no doubt, very carefully, but yet misreckoned now and then a Year.

Ptolemy began his Canon with the *Æra* of *Nabonasar*, and on that Day of the Month on which the *Egyptian Tbotb* fell; because he found that astronomical Observations were about that Time accurately made and assigned to that *Æra*. He found that *Hipparchus* had deduced and carried on his celestial Observations from about that Time: who, as *Pliny* (5) relates, gave an Account of Eclipses both of the Sun and Moon for six hundred Years. *Hipparchus* made his first astronomical Observations in the Year before *Christ* 162: and continued them to the Year before *Christ* 130 and after. *Proclus* (6) saies, that *Jamblicus* related that *Hipparchus* wrote that the *Affyrians* (or *Babylonians*) had kept celestial Observations for twenty-seven Myriads of Years (*i. e.* Days) which made 750 *Chaldean* Years of 360 Days, or 739 *Julian*

(5) *Utriusque sideris cursum in sexcentos annos præcinuit Hipparchus, menses gentium, diesque et horas—complexus. Nat. Hist. lib. ii. c. 12.*

(6) In *Timæ. Platon. p. 31.*

Years. This Account carries the *Chaldaean* Observations above a Century higher than the *Æra* of *Nabonasar*. But the first Eclipse which (7) *Ptolemy* could find observed in the *Chaldaean* Annals was of the Moon in the Year before *Christ* 721, which was the first Year of the Reign of *Mardokempad*, in Scripture *Merodach-Baladan*, the twenty-seventh Year of *Nabonasar*; and it was the twenty-ninth Day of the *Thoth* of that Year, which commenced *February* the 20th, and so it was on the 19th Day of *March*.

Another Argument that the Astronomical Canon was composed by *Ptolemy*, is, that the Years of it are *Egyptian*, as he himself tells us in his *Almagest*; and so go backward by a Change of the Place of the *Thoth* without Intercalation of the odd Hours. But the *Babylonians* and *Chaldeans* knew nothing of this Method, nor ever changed the *Thoth* of their Year: and the *Æra* of *Nabonasar* consisted of Years of three hundred and sixty Days, with five intercalary Days at the End of each Year.

This was the fixed *Chaldaean* Year in the Time of *Nabonasar*: and it does not appear that the *Babylonians* ever used the *Egyptian* Year, which moved backward one Day in four Years, but probably added six intercalary Days every fourth Year after the fix odd Hours were observed. So that *Ptolemy* framed the Canon out of the History and Annals of *Chaldaean* Writers; and set down the celestial Observations which he found in *Epigenes*, *Berosus*, *Hipparchus*, and others: and *Syncellus* (8) tells us from *Ptolemy* himself, that other *Greeks* before him made use of the *Æra* of *Nabonasar* in their Astronomical Computations. And the Reason of the *Greeks* using this *Æra*, was, that after the Institution of it the *Chaldeans* had given them a more perfect

(7) Mag. Construct. lib. iv. c. 6. p. 95.

(8) *Ἦτις (Χαλδαίων) ἀρχὴ ἀπὸ Σαλμανασάρ, ὃν ἡ Ναβονασάρ καλεῖται λαμβάνεται πρῶτον τε Χαλδαίοις ἐν τῇ τῶν ἀστέρων ψηφοφορίᾳ, καὶ πρῶτον τοῖς Ἑλλήνων μαθηματικοῖς, ὡς μαρτυρεῖ ὁ σοφώτατος Κλαύδιος ὁ Πτολεμαῖος ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ συντάξει τῆς ἀστρονομίας. Syncel. Chronograph. p. 206. and p. 207, he saies: Ἀπὸ δὲ Ναβονασάρ τὸς χρόνος τῶν ἀστέρων κινήσεως Χαλδαῖαι ἠκρίβωσαν ἢ ἀπὸ Χαλδαίων οἱ παρ' Ἑλλήσι μαθηματικοὶ λαβόντες.

Knowledge of the Motion of the Stars, and referred all their Observations to that *Æra*. Hence it is plain that *Ptolemy's* Canon is a Deduction of *Egyptian* Years from the *Nabonasarean* *Æra*, which Years *Ptolemy* applied to it and computed from it, after the manner of the *Egyptian* Astronomers, by a Retrogradation of the *Tboths* of the Years, which he constantly takes notice of.

The *Chaldaean* and *Egyptian* Years consisted each of twelve Months of thirty Days, with five intercalary Days. *Ptolemy* mentions (9) the first, third, and fourth of the intercalary Days: but the remaining Part of a Day, which was in both these Years over and above three hundred and sixty-five Days was not intercalated in the *Egyptian* Year, but was intercalated in the *Chaldaean*. So that the *Tboth* of the *Egyptian* Year went back six Hours every Year, or a Day in four Years; but the *Chaldaean* Year was fixed and invariable.

Ptolemy therefore used the *Æra* of *Nabonasar*, as being most exactly fixed by astronomical Observations; but he used the *Egyptian* Year and Months, and counted in his Calculations the Quarter of a Day to make them more exact. He found, as *Hipparchus* had (10) observed be-

(9) *Almag.* five Mag. Construct. lib. iii. c. 2.

(10) *Almag.* lib. iii. c. 2. *Hipparchus* differed but about six Minutes from the latest and best Observations, for he made the Year three hundred and sixty-five Days, five Hours, fifty-five Minutes, and twelve Seconds. The two old Astronomers *Meton* and *Euclémon*, whose *Enneadecaeteris*, or Cycle of 19 Years began in the Year before *Christ* 432, reckoned the Year to consist of 365 Days and a quarter, and the 76th Part of a Day, as *Ptolemy* relates from *Hipparchus*; and *Calippus*, he saies, reckoned it 365 Days and a quarter only. Κατὰ μὲν τὰς αἰὲς Μέτονα καὶ Εὐκλήμονα ὁ ἐνιαύσιος χρόνος αἰεὶ ἔχει ἡμέρας τξεί. (365.) δ' (i. e. a quarter,) καὶ ες'. μιᾶς ἡμέρας καὶ ἡ Κάλλιππος, ἡμέρας τξεί. δ' μόνον. *Calippus* began his Period in the Year before *Christ* 329, and in the Year of *Rome* 424. *Censorinus* saies, Meton vero [annum naturalem dies habere prodidit] 365 et dierum quinque undevigesimam partem: i. e. six Hours and nearly twenty Minutes, which is but a Minute more than the seventy-sixth Part of a Day, *De die Natal.* c. 19. But of *Calippus* he saies, that he made the Year consist of 365 Days; which is a Mistake; he probably wrote 365 Days and a quarter. He also saies, that *Aristarchus Samius* (who flourished an hundred and forty-five Years before *Hipparchus*, or about the Year before *Christ* 280.) made the Year 365 Days, and the 1623d Part of a Day: the latter Number is probably an Error of the Copier, and should be the *seventeenth Part* of a Day for

fore him about the Year before *Christ* 130, that the Year consisted of three hundred and sixty-five Days and something less than a Quarter of a Day. What this Deficiency was, he saies he could not find out, because it made no observable Difference in many Years; and therefore he allowed and added a Day in four Years: but he saies that when in a Course of Observations of many Years the Difference, small as it was, should be found out, it ought to be distributed amongst the Years which intervened. This he thinks, after *Hipparchus*, was a Difference only of a three hundredth Part of a natural Day, or almost *five* Minutes. Later Observations have shewn that the Difference is *eleven* Minutes; and that the equinoctial Year consists of three hundred and sixty-five Days five Hours and forty-nine Minutes, as near as can be discovered,

Alfraganus (11), or *Alferganus*, an *Arabian* Writer and cotemporary with *Syncellus*, saies, that the Epoch which *Ptolemy* used in his great astronomical Work, was deduced from the Beginning of the Reign of *Nabonasar*: but that the *Egyptian* Æra, expressed in *Ptolemy's* Tables, proceeds from the Beginning of the Years of *Philip (Aridæus)*, and *Syncellus* (12) is of the same Opinion. The Truth is, *Ptolemy* formed his Canon from three Æras; the first was that of *Nabonasar*, which ended at the Death of *Alexander the Great*; the second was that of *Philip Aridæus*, which ended at the Æra *Augustorum*, which

as *Franciscus Modius* read it. See the Notes on ch. 19. *Aphrodisius* made the Year 365 Days and the eighth Part of a Day, or three Hours. *Oenopides* made it 365 Days and the fifty-ninth Part of twenty-two Days, *i. e.* something more than nine Hours. The old *Egyptians* made it 365 Days and a quarter, and *Eudoxus* was the first who carried this Account of the Year from *Egypt* into *Greece*, about the Year before *Christ* 366.

(11) *Alfraganus*, vel *Alferganus*, Arabs, ejusdem ævi scriptor cum *Syncello*, dicit: Ægyptiorum (leg. Assyriorum) Epochâ usurpata in magno *Ptolemæi* opere subducitur a principio ejus anni quo regnare cœpit *Nabonassar*. At æra Ægyptiaca in *Ptolemæi* tabulis seu canone expressa procedit ab initio annorum *Philippi (Aridæi)*.—*Apud Astronom. Element. edit. Gol. 4°. 1669. p. 6. citat. in Prolegom. Joan. Maslôn. ad Kalendar. mens. var. gent. p. 20.*

(12) *Chronograph. p. 326. See also p. 207.*

commenced the Year after the Battle at *Actium*, and on the twenty-ninth Day of *August*, according to (13) *Syncellus*, *Maximus*, and *Peta-vius*, and according to others on the (14) thirty-first, and in the Year before *Christ* 30.

There has been a Difficulty concerning the Title of the *Ptolemaic* Canon, and the Series of Kings therein mentioned, whose Times are coincident with the Reigns of several Kings of *Affyria* and *Media* mentioned in Scripture, none of which, except *Asar-Haddon*, are found in the Canon : and yet the Canon in the present Copies is entitled, *Ptolemy's* (15) *Canon of the Kings of the Affyrians and Medes*. But this is an erroneous Title added by some who were ignorant of the Meaning of the Canon. There is not the least Pretence to call it the Canon of *Median* Kings, there not being one King of *Media* in it ; and the Kingdom of *Media* being distinct both from the *Affyrian* and *Babylonian* Empire, from the Time of the Beginning of it. And though it appears from *Herodotus*, *Xenophon*, *Strabo*, *Pliny*, *Solinus*, and others, that the *Babylonians* were called *Affyrians* after the Destruction of the *Affyrian* Empire, when *Babylon* was esteemed the Head City of that Empire ; yet whilst *Nineveh* and the *Affyrian* Empire were standing, they were distinguished : and the Canon comprehends none but Kings who lived and reigned at *Babylon* till after the Conquest of it by the *Per-fians* ; and therefore it is properly the Canon of the *Chaldaean* Kings, as *Syncellus* (16) calls it. And as the *Nabonafarean* Æra was formed at *Babylon*, and founded upon (17) astronomical Observations taken there, it

(13) Ibid. p. 326. Max. Comput. Ecclesiast. apud Petav. Uranolog. p. 351. Petav. Doctrin. temp. lib. x. c. 69.

(14) Uffer. Annal. Mund. p. 490. part. poster.

(15) Πτολεμαίος πάντων βασιλέων Ασσυρίων καὶ Μίδων.

(16) Τὰ ὑπὸ Ναβονασάρεος ἔτη — βασιλέως Χαλδαίων, Chronograph. p. 207. and he calls the Kings Χαλδαίων βασιλεῖς, p. 209. See Cellar. Geog. antiq. lib. iii. p. 626, 639.

(17) Ἀπὸ Ναβονασάρεος οὗτο ἔχουσιν τὸ τῶν ἀστέρων κινήσεως Χαλδαῖοι ἠρεῖσθαι, Syncel. p. 207. Omnes rationes astronomicæ veterum non ex Affyria, sed ex Challdæa, et quidem ejus metropoli, Babylone petuntur, quare epochæ temporum non ab Affyrio rege, sed a Chaldæo ordiendæ sunt. Scalig. de Emen-dat. Tempor. lib. v. p. 393.

is not probable that *Ptolemy's* Canon deduced from it should contain any other than the Succession of the Kings of *Chaldæa* and *Babylon*; of which (18) *Nabonasar* was the first.

Ptolemy's Canon of the Chaldæan, Persian, Greek and Roman Kings, from Nabonasar to Antoninus Pius; taken from two Manuscripts, one published by (19) Overall; and the other by Petavius, from the royal Library at Paris.

	Year before Christ.	Years of Reign.	Sum.collected.	Years of Nabonasar.
1. <i>Nabonasar</i>	747	14	14	1st
2. <i>Nadius</i>	733	02	16	15th
3. <i>Cincirus</i> and <i>Porus</i>	731	05	21	17th
4. <i>Jugæus</i>	726	05	26	22d
5. <i>Mardokempad</i>	721	12	38	27th
6. <i>Arcian</i>	709	05	43	39th
7. First Interregnum	704	02	45	44th
8. <i>Belibus</i>	702	03	48	46th
9. <i>Apronadius</i>	699	06	54	49th
10. <i>Rigibelus</i>	693	01	55	55th
11. <i>Meseffimordacus</i>	692	04	59	56th
12. Second Interregnum	688	08	67	60th
13. <i>Asaradinus</i>	680	13	80	68th
14. <i>Saosduchinus</i> (20)	667	20	100	81st

(18) Apud Ptolemæum et astronomos reliquos celeberrima est æra Nabonassar, quem Babylone regnasse inter omnes convenit. Petav. rationar. temp. part. ii. lib. 3. c. 3. p. 839.

(19) Apud Calvis. Chronolog. p. 79. and Petav. Rationar. temp. in fin.

(20) In Syncellus's Copy of *Ptolemy's* Canon *Saosduchinus* has no more than nine Years, and *Chyniladanus* no more than fourteen Years: and the last mentioned Reign ends in the collected Year 103. But it appears from *Ptolemy's* Almagest, lib. v. p. 125. that there was an Eclipse of the Moon in the fifth Year of *Nabopolassar*, and in the hundred and twenty-seventh Year of *Nabonasar*, which proves that he began to reign in the hundred and twenty-third Year of that Æra. [See Petav. Doct. tempor. lib. ix. c. 58.] therefore there are nineteen Years wanting in the fourteenth and fifteenth Reigns above-mentioned. And the Manuscripts of *Overall* and *Paris* have rightly supplied them.

Of the *Æra* of Nabonasar,

	<i>Year before Christ.</i>	<i>Years of Reign.</i>	<i>Sum collected.</i>	<i>Years of Nabonasar.</i>
15. <i>Cymiladanus</i>	— 647	— 22	— 122	— 101st
16. <i>Nabopolasar</i>	— 625	— 21	— 143	— 123d
17. <i>Nabocolasar, i. e.</i> <i>Nabuchadnezzar</i>	} 604	— 43	— 186	— 144th
18. <i>Ioarodamus</i> (21), <i>i. e. Evil-Merodach</i>		— 02	— 188	— 187th
19. <i>Niricassolasar</i> (22)	559	— 04	— 192	— 189th
20. <i>Nabonadius</i>	— 555	— 17	— 209	— 193d

Persian Kings of Ptolemy's Canon.

	<i>Year before Christ.</i>	<i>Years of Reign.</i>	<i>Sum collected.</i>	<i>Years of Nabonasar.</i>
1. <i>Cyrus</i>	— 538	— 09	— 218	— 210th
2. <i>Cambyfes</i>	— 529	— (23) 08	— 226	— 219th
3. <i>Darius, Son of</i> <i>Hystaspes</i>	} 521	— (24) 36	— 262	— 227th

(21) The Copy of *Syncellus* gives to the 18th King *three Years*, p. 208.

(22) The Copy of *Syncellus* gives to the 19th King *five Years*. And the Ecclesiastical Computation, published by *Maximus, Africanus, Cedrenus*, and *Syncellus*, agree to give to the 18th and 19th Reigns eight Years. And this seems to be the true Sum of these two Reigns, reckoning in them the nine Months of *Laborsoarchod* omitted in the Canon. For 'tis probable that *Evil-Merodach* reigned some Months more than two Years, and *Niricassolasar* some Months more than four Years, which with the nine Months of *Laborsoarchod* made eight Years in all. But *Ptolemy* finding no odd Months mentioned in *Berosus* or the *Chaldean History* but the nine of *Laborsoarchod*, which he omitted, as being less than a Year, he set down no more than six Years for the Reigns of the 18th and 19th Kings: And so the Error of two Years in these Reigns are not in the present Copies of *Ptolemy's* Canon which I have followed, but in the Canon itself; which Error we have much better Evidence to prove, than any that can be alledged for the Canon, though it is of great Value and Use.

(23) *Cambyfes* reigned no more than seven Years and five Months, and *Smerdes* the Magian reigned seven Months, which were added to the Reign of *Cambyfes*, and made it eight Years, Herodot. lib. iii. c. 66, 67.

(24) The true Epoch of the Reign of *Darius* was in the Year before *Christ* 519 just begun, or 520 completed. For the *Tboth* of his Reign fell on the last Day of *December*. And this agrees exactly to the Date of his Reign in the *Parian Marbles*, when rightly read, as appears from the following Observations. The Number of the Commencement of the Reign of *Darius* in the *Parian Marbles*, as now read, *Epoch* xlv. l. 59. is HHΓIII *i. e.* two hundred and fifty-three Years before the Date or latest Term of the Marbles in

4. *Xerxes*

	Year before Christ.	Years of Reign.	Sum collected.	Years of Nabonassar.
4. Xerxes (25)	485	21	283	263d

the Year before Christ 264. By this Reckoning *Darius* began to reign in the Year before Christ 517, two Years later than I have supposed. This is the Number of the Marbles, as Mr. *Selden* read them; and *Lydiat* and *Palmerius* follow his Reading, and so they are published by *Prideaux*. But the Number of the fiftieth Epoch, l. lxiii. which mentions the Death of *Darius*, and the Beginning of the Reign of *Xerxes* shews that the Number of the 45th Epoch was mistaken by *Selden*. That Number is HHΔΔΠ *i. e.* two hundred and twenty-five, which added to the Date of the Marbles two hundred and sixty-four, places the Beginning of *Xerxes* in the Year before Christ 489. By which two Numbers, if both are right, *Darius* could only reign twenty-eight Years; which is contrary to all ancient historical Evidence whatsoever: though *Maximus* gives him this Number of Years only in his Ecclesiastical Computation, which has many Errors in it: but *Ptolemy* found a lunar Eclipse noted in the thirty-first Year of his Reign, which he has set down in the fourth Book of his *Almagest*. The Number of this latter Epoch of the Marbles is undoubtedly right, as appears from the Number of the following Epoch, which is HHΔΔΠ *i. e.* two hundred and twenty-two; and therefore the preceding Number HHΔΔΠ *i. e.* two hundred and twenty-five, cannot be an Error, or be supposed to be HHΔΔΠ two hundred and twenty-two, because the Facts in the Epoch 225 are in the Reign of a prior Archon. So that it is very probable that the Number of the 45th Epoch, which *Selden* read HHΔΔΠ *i. e.* two hundred and fifty-three, was originally in the Marbles HHΔΔΠ *i. e.* two hundred and fifty-six. The Top of the Π was so much worn out, or so eaten, as made *Selden* think it to be Π; and this is the more probable, because it places the Reign of *Darius* in the End of the Year before Christ 520, or the Beginning of the Year 519, and also allows thirty-one Years to his Reign, which is the Term which *Ctesias* gives to it, and whose Account the Author of the Marbles seems to have followed, and so has placed *Xerxes* four or five Years too high. See Excerpt. ex Ctes. Persic. ad fin. Herodot. p. 643, and Phot. Biblioth. Cod. lxxii. See also Not. *Prideaux* ad Chron. Marmor. p. 211. But then, as the *Ptolemaic* Canon, and *Herodotus* and *Manetho*, and other ancient Historians agree that *Darius* reigned thirty-six Years, the Number of *Ctesias* and the Marbles must be wrong: and thirty-six Years being given to the Reign of *Darius*, *Xerxes* his Son must begin to reign in the Year before Christ 484 ending; the *Thoth*, or Beginning of his Reign commencing December 22, according to the *Egyptian* Reckoning, as is shown by the *Astronomical* Canon. The famous Battle at *Marathon*, in which the Army of *Darius* was defeated by *Miltiades* the *Athenian* General, ought to be placed in the Year before Christ 488, which was four Years before the Death of *Darius*, as *Herodotus* informs us, lib. vii. c. 1, 4. The Marbles and the vulgar Chronology place it in the Year before Christ 490.

(25) The seven Months of *Artabanus* being added to the Reign of *Xerxes*

5. *Arta-*

	Year before Christ.	Years of Reign.	Sum collected.	Years of Nabonasar.
5. Artaxerxes (26)	464	— 41	— 324	— 284th
6. Darius II.	— 423	— 19	— 343	— 325th
7. Artaxerxes II. called Mnemon	(27) 404	— 46	— 389	— 344th

made it twenty-one Years. The great Chronologer and Mathematician *Eratosthenes* made *Xerxes* to reign in the Year before *Christ* 484. He reckoned the Destruction of *Troy* four hundred and seven Years before the Olympiads, (*i. e.* the Year before *Christ* 1183) from the taking of *Troy* he reckoned eighty Years to the Return of the *Heracidae*, (*i. e.* 1103) thence to the building of *Ionia* sixty Years, (*i. e.* before *Christ* 1043) thence to the Guardianship of *Lycurgus* an hundred and fifty-nine Years, (*i. e.* before *Christ* 884) thence to the Olympiads an hundred and eight Years, (*i. e.* the Year before *Christ* 776) thence to the Expedition of *Xerxes* two hundred and ninety-seven Years, (*i. e.* the Year before *Christ* 479) and this was in the sixth Year of his Reign, as *Herodotus* tells us, lib. vii. c. 7. and therefore by this Computation *Xerxes* began to reign in the Year before *Christ* 484. *Eratosthenes* adds, from the Expedition of *Xerxes* to the *Peloponnesian* War forty-eight Years, (*i. e.* the Year before *Christ* 431) thence to the Death of *Philip* of *Macedon* ninety-six Years, (*i. e.* the Year before *Christ* 335) thence to the Death of *Alexander* twelve Years, (*i. e.* the Year before *Christ* 323.) Apud Clem. Alex. Strom. i. p. 402. *Diodorus Siculus*, lib. xi. p. 457. puts the Death of *Xerxes* in the End of the fourth Year of the seventy-eighth Olympiad, and in the twenty-first Year of his Reign, *i. e.* in the Year before *Christ* 484. So his Reign began in the Year before *Christ* 484. And this agrees to his saying in the Beginning of the same Book that *Xerxes* began his Expedition into *Greece* in the first Year of the 75th Olympiad, *i. e.* the Year before *Christ* 480: and for this Expedition, he had made Preparations three Years before, [τεσσερὶ ἔτεσιν ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ, lib. xi. p. 404.] and so he began to reign, as above, in the Year before *Christ* 484. For *Diodorus* reckons the three Years Preparation from the Time of his Conquest of *Egypt* in the second Year of his Reign, as *Herodotus* saies it was, lib. vii. p. 384.

(26) *Artaxerxes* has forty-one Years, including the short Reigns of *Xerxes* the Second, which was forty-five Days, and of *Sogdianus*, which was six Months and fifteen Days, in all eight Months: but *Diodorus Siculus*, not reckoning the Time of these Reigns to that of *Artaxerxes*, gives to his Reign no more than forty Years, lib. xii. p. 522.

(27) *Artaxerxes Mnemon* reigned forty-six Years, according to the *Ptolemaic* Canon, and the Copy of it in *Syncellus*. But the Ecclesiastical Computation gives him no more than forty Years: and *Eusebius* the same Number in his *Chronicon*; and *Jerome*, in his Comment on *Ezekiel*, ch. v.

	Year before Christ.	Years of Reign.	Sum collected.	Years of Nabonasar.
8. Ocbus (28)	— 358	— 21	— 410	— 390th
9. Arses	— 337	— 02	— 412	— 411th
10. Darius III. called Codomannus	— 335	— 04	— 416	— 413th
11. Alexander (29) of Macedon	— 331	— 08	— 424	— 417th

Kings who reigned after Alexander.

	Year before Christ.	Years of Reign.	Sum collected.	Years of Nabonasar.
1. Philip Aridæus	— 324	— 7	— 431	— 425th
1. Alexander Ægus	— 317	— 12	— 443	— 432d

p. 720. edit. Benedict. also the Paschal Chronicon, and *Anastasius*; and *Petavius* follows this Number. *Clemens Alexandrinus* gives him forty-two Years, *Ström.* i. p. 395. and so *Plutarch* in the End of his Life: where it is sixty-two by an Error of the Copier for forty-two. *Diod. Siculus*, lib. xiii. p. 630. and lib. xv. p. 76. saies he reigned forty-three Years: and this seems to be the truest Number. *Ctesias* said he reigned forty-two Years, Excerpt. ad fin. *Herodot.* p. 650.

(28) *Ocbus* began to reign in the Year before *Christ* 357, according to the Parian Marbles.

(29) *Alexander* died the 22d Day of *May*, which, according to the Reckoning of the Canon, was in the Year before *Christ* 323, and it was four hundred and twenty-four *Egyptian* Years from the Epoch of the *Nabonassar* Æra to his Death, as *Ptolemy* relates, *Almag.* lib. iii. p. 79. and it was the four hundred and twenty-fifth Year of *Nabonasar*. But though *Alexander* did not die till the 22d Day of *May* in the Year before *Christ* 323, yet the *Egyptians* computed the new Æra of *Philip*, who succeeded him, from the *Thoth*, which fell on the 12th of *November* in the Year before *Christ* 324, and thence the Æra of *Philip* commenced, as *Censorinus* tells us, de D. nat. c. xxi. p. 128. Item (anni) Philippi qui ab excessu Alexandri Magni numerantur, et ad hunc usque perducti (sc. ad an. Ch. 238) annos 562 consummant: sed horum initia semper a primo die mensis ejus sumuntur, cui apud Ægyptios nomen est *Thoth*. See *Usser.* *Annal. Mund.* p. 401. part. prior. *Josephus* saies, that all agreed that *Alexander* died in the 114th Olympiad, i. e. in the Year before *Christ* 324. cont. *Apion.* lib. i. p. 455. And in this Year *Censorinus* placed his Death. And *Eusebius* placeth it in the same Year, *Chron.* lib. poster. And *Ptolemy* himself reckoned from the *Thoth* of the Year before *Christ* 324: for he reckoned from the Death of *Alexander* to the Reign of *Augustus* two hundred and ninety-four Years, *Almag.* lib. iii. p. 79. and they are exactly so many Years computed from the

Græcian

Græcian Kings of Egypt.

	<i>Year before Christ.</i>	<i>Years of Reign.</i>	<i>Sum collected.</i>	<i>Years of Nabonasar.</i>
1. <i>Ptolemy, Son of Lagus</i>	305	20	463	444th
2. <i>Pt. Philadelphus</i>	285	38	501	464th
3. <i>Pt. Euergetes I.</i>	247	25	526	502d
4. <i>Pt. Philopator</i>	222	17	543	527th
5. <i>Pt. Epiphanes</i>	205	24	567	544th
6. <i>Pt. Philometor</i>	181	35	602	568th
7. <i>Pt. Euergetes II.</i>	146	29	631	603d
8. <i>Pt. Soter</i>	117	36	667	632d
9. <i>Dionysius</i>	081	29	696	668th
10. <i>Cleopatra</i>	052	22	718	697th

Kings of the Romans.

	<i>Year before Christ.</i>	<i>Years of Reign.</i>	<i>Sum collected.</i>	<i>Years of Nabonasar.</i>
1. <i>Augustus</i>	30	43	761	719th
	A.D.			
2. <i>Tiberius</i>	14	22	783	762d
3. <i>Caius</i>	36	04	787	784th
4. <i>Claudius</i>	40	14	801	788th
5. <i>Nero</i>	54	14	815	802d
6. <i>Vespasian</i>	68	10	825	816th
7. <i>Titus</i>	78	03	828	826th
8. <i>Domitian</i>	81	15	843	829th
9. <i>Nerva</i>	96	01	844	844th
10. <i>Trajan</i>	97	19	863	845th
11. <i>Adrian</i>	116	21	884	864th
12. <i>Antoninus Pius</i>	137	23	907	885th

Here ended the Computation of *Ptolemy* from the Beginning of the *Æra* of Nabonasar. And that the Numbers, as I have given them from

Year before Christ 324. So that the *Egyptians* seem to have begun the *Æra* of *Philip* from the *Tbotb* which preceded the Death of *Alexander*, and was November 12th in the Year before Christ 324.

the *Parisian* Manuscript of *Petavius* and a prior one of Dr. *Overall*, are right and the same with *Ptolemy's* own original Numbers, will appear from the following Observations out of *Ptolemy's* great astronomical Work, called *Almagest*.

Ptolemy (30) saies, that from the Reign of *Nabonasar* to the Death of *Alexander* there were four hundred and twenty-four *Egyptian* Years: and that from the Death of *Alexander* to the Reign of *Augustus* are two hundred and ninety-four Years: and that from the first Year of *Augustus* and the first *Thoth*, according to the *Egyptians*, unto the seventeenth Year of *Adrian*, and the seventh Day of the Month *Atbyr* (*November*), are an hundred and sixty-one Years, sixty-six Days, and two Hours: and so from the first Year of *Nabonasar* and the first *Thoth*, according to the *Egyptian* Computation, to the seventeenth Year of *Adrian*, are eight hundred and seventy-nine Years, sixty-six Days, and two Hours, reckoned from the Noon. All this agrees exactly to the foregoing Numbers of the *Nabonassarean* Era, etc.

He (31) reckons from the second Year of *Mardokempad* (the fifth *Chaldean* King) to the nineteenth of *Adrian*, eight hundred and fifty-four *Egyptian* Years: and just so many they are by the foregoing Canon. He reckons (32) from the first of *Nabonasar* to the thirty-first of *Darius*, Son of *Hystaspes*, two hundred and fifty-six Years: and again he (33) computes from the first of *Nabonasar* to the eighth of *Adrian* eight hundred and seventy-one Years: all which entirely agrees to the Numbers of the Canon. Again he (34) computes eight hundred and eighty-five *Egyptian* Years from the Epoch of *Nabonasar* to the second Year of *Antoninus*. And he (35) counts eight hundred and eighty-two *Egyptian* Years from the first of *Nabonasar* to the twentieth of *Adrian*: he also reckons (36) the fifth of *Nabopolassar* to be the hun-

(30) *Almag.* lib. iii. p. 79.

(31) *Ibid.* lib. iv. c. 7.

(32) *Ibid.* lib. iv. c. 9.

(33) *Ibid.*

(34) *Almag.* lib. v. c. 3. p. 111.

(35) *Ibid.* c. 13. p. 123.

(36) *Ibid.* c. 14.

dred and twenty-seventh Year from *Nabonasar* and an hundred and twenty-six *Egyptian* Years: again he reckons (37) the seventh of *Cambyses* to be the two hundred and twenty-fifth of *Nabonasar*, and two hundred and twenty-four *Egyptian* Years. He (38) reckons the seventh Year of *Philometor* to be the five hundred and seventy-fourth of *Nabonasar*, and five hundred and seventy-three *Egyptian* Years. He (39) reckons the twelfth of *Domitian* to be the eight hundred and fortieth Year of *Nabonasar*: he also reckons the first of *Trajan* to be the eight hundred and forty-fifth of *Nabonasar*. He (40) also computes the second of *Antoninus* to be the eight hundred and eighty-sixth Year of *Nabonasar*: and he counts (41) the fifty-second Year from the Death of *Alexander* to be the four hundred and seventy-sixth Year from *Nabonasar*. All these several Computations agree exactly to the Numbers of the Astronomical Canon above given, and confirm the Truth of the Copies whence they are taken.

The Canon of *Ptolemy* has been justly esteemed by Chronologers as an invaluable Treasure, and of the greatest Use in Chronology: but yet it is not infallible, as I have shewn. And it is certain, that besides the Errors observed above in the *Nabonassarean* *Æra*, there is also a Mistake of one Year in the *Augustan* *Æra*. This *Æra*, by *Ptolemy's* Reckoning, began at the Death of *Cleopatra* in the Year before *Christ* 30, and he gave forty-three Years to the Reign of *Augustus*, which ended in the Year of our Lord 14. *Tiberius* began to reign *August* the 19th. A. D. 14, and reigned twenty-two Years six Months and twenty-six Days to *March* the 16th A. D. 37. But by *Ptolemy's* Reckoning his Reign ended A. D. 36. *Caius Caligula* succeeded *Tiberius*, and reigned three Years ten Months and eight Days to *January* 24th A. D. 41. But by *Ptolemy's* Canon his Reign ended A. D. 40. *Claudius* succeeded and reigned thirteen Years eight Months and twenty Days to *October* 13th A. D. 54. This Year agrees with the *Ptolemaic* Canon. *Nero*

(37) *Almag.* lib. v. c. 14.

(38) *Almag.* lib. vi. c. 5.

(39) *Ibid.* lib. vii. c. 3.

(40) *Almag.* lib. ix. c. 10. p. 236.

(41) *Ibid.* lib. x. c. 9. See also lib. iii. c. 2. p. 62.

succeeded

succeeded *Claudius*, and reigned thirteen Years seven Months twenty-eight Days to *June* 9th A. D. 68. when he killed himself. *Galba* succeeded and reigned seven Months and seven Days, to *January* 15th A. D. 69, when he was killed by *Otho*, *August* 6th; in his Reign was the *Egyptian Tboth* of this Year; yet he is omitted by *Ptolemy*, because he reigned less than a Year. *Otho* reigned three Months and two Days to *April* 16th A. D. 69, when he killed himself. There was no *Tboth* in his Reign, and he is omitted by *Ptolemy*. After *Otho* *Vitellius* reigned eight Months and five Days to *December* 20th A. D. 69, and there was a *Tboth* in his Reign, viz. *August* 6th, but he also is omitted by *Ptolemy*, as reigning less than a Year. After *Vitellius* *Vespasian* reigned ten Years all but six Days, reckoned from the first Day of *July* A. D. 69, when he was set up for Emperor by the Army; and his Reign was reckoned from thence. He died *June* 24th A. D. 79. But the *Ptolemaic* Canon placeth the Reign of *Vespasian* A. D. 68, and of his Son *Titus* A. D. 78. *Titus* succeeded *Vespasian*, and reigned two Years two Months and twenty Days, and died *September* 13th A. D. 81. *Ptolemy*, by giving three Years to his Reign, carried it down rightly to A. D. 81. and he seems to have given him three Years, because there were three *Tboths* in his Reign. *Domitian* succeeded *Titus*, A. D. 81. and reigned fifteen Years and six Days, and was slain *September* 18th A. D. 96. *Nerva* succeeded *Domitian*, A. D. 96. to which Year the Canon agrees; and reigned one Year four Months eleven Days, and died *January* 27th, A. D. 98. But the Canon placeth *Trajan*, who succeeded *Nerva*, A. D. 97. *Trajan* began to reign *January* 27th, A. D. 98. and reigned nineteen Years and six Months and fifteen Days, and died the 11th of *August*, A. D. 117. But according to the Reckoning of the *Ptolemaic* Canon, his Successor *Adrian* began to reign, A. D. 116. *Adrian* reigned twenty-one Years and ten Months and twenty-eight Days, and died on the 10th of *July*, A. D. 138. *Antoninus Pius* succeeded him, and reigned twenty-three Years, and died the 7th of *March*, A. D. 161. But by the Computation of the Canon, his Reign ended A. D. 160. So that in the whole *Augustan* Æra, the Canon has counted one Year too little.

Having explained and set forth the *Ptolemaic Canon*, which contains a Term of above 900 Years; and having discovered two or three Errors in it, which are of great Importance, I shall exhibit it again to the Reader's View, corrected as it ought to be.

The truest Account of the Period from Nabonasar to Antoninus Pius.

	<i>Year before Christ.</i>	<i>Years of Reign.</i>	<i>Sum collected.</i>	<i>Years of Nabonasar.</i>
1 Nabonasar	747	14	14	1st
2 Nadius	733	2	16	15th
3 Cincirus and } Porns }	731	5	21	17th
4 Jugæus	726	5	26	22d.
5 Mardakempad	721	12	38	27th
6 Arcianus	709	5	43	39th
7 Interreg. 1st.	704	2	45	44th
8 Belibus	702	3	48	46th
9 Apronadius	699	6	54	49th
10 Rigebelus	693	1	55	55th
11 Mefiffimordacus	692	4	59	56th
12 Interreg. 2d.	688	8	67	60th
13 Afaradinus	680	13	80	68th
14 Sæfducbinus	667	20	100	81st
15 Chyniladanus	647	22	122	101st
16 Nabopolafar	625	21	143	123d
17 Nabucalafar	604	43	186	144th
18 Itovarodamus (23)	561	3	189	187th
19 Niricaffelafar	558	4	193	190th
20 Laborefarchod	554	9 m.	194	194th
21 Nabonadius	553	17	211	195th

(23) The Reason of assigning three Years to the eighteenth King, is given in the foregoing Canon, and also of adding the Reign of *Laborefarchod*, who is omitted by *Ptolemy*.

Perſian

Persian Kings.

	Year before Christ.	Years of Reign.	Sum collected.	Years of Nabonasar.
1 Cyrus (24)	536	— 9	— 220	— 212th
2 Cambyfes (25)	527	— 8	— 228	— 221st

(24) This Table shews, that the Captivity of the Jews, which is reckoned from the first Year of *Nabopolassar* to the second of *Cyrus*, was seventy Years, as the Prophets relate it to be : but the *Ptolemaic Canon* makes it no more than sixty-eight Years ; which demonstrates that there is an Error of two Years in it, which also I proved from the *Tyrian Annals*.

(25) In *Africanus's* Copy of the twenty-seventh Dynasty of *Manetho*, *Cambyfes* is said to reign six Years after his Conquest of *Egypt* ; and therefore it was in the second Year of his Reign [and not in the fifth, as it is said to be by a numeral Error there] that he invaded *Egypt* : for he reigned no more than seven Years and five Months ; and the seven Months of *Oropastes*, or *Smerdis* the *Magian*, are added to his Reign. *Egypt* was conquered in the End of the Year before *Christ* 526, or the Beginning of the Year 525. and so *Cambyfes* began to reign in the Year before *Christ* 527. To confirm this further, *Diodorus Siculus* relates [lib. i. p. 79.] that *Amasis* King of *Egypt* died about the same Time, or the same Year that *Cambyfes* made his Expedition against *Egypt* ; and that it was in the third Year of the sixty-third *Olympiad*, i. e. the Year before *Christ* 526 ending, or the Beginning of the Year 525. and as he reigned six Years after this, according to *Africanus's* Copy of *Manetho*, which is the best Authority we can have, it plainly follows, that he made his Expedition into *Egypt* in the second Year of his Reign, and died six Years after his Conquest of *Egypt*, in the Year before *Christ* 519, and began his Reign in the Year before *Christ* 527. *Eusebius* having placed the Conquest of *Egypt* by *Cambyfes* in the fifth Year of his Reign, has misled all later Chronologers. But there is the best Evidence in the World, that *Cambyfes* invaded and conquered *Egypt* in the second Year of his Reign, or Beginning of his third. *Herodotus* (lib. iii.) saies, that *Cambyfes* staid several Years in *Egypt*, after he had conquered it : and in the Beginning of his second Book he saies, that *Cambyfes*, soon after he came to the Throne of *Persia*, prepared for his Expedition against *Egypt*. And *Dion*, in his *Persic History*, and *Lynceas Naucratis*, in his third Book of *Egyptian History* [apud Athenæi Deipnos. lib. xiii. p. 360.] suppose, that *Cambyfes* made War upon *Egypt* soon after the Death of *Cyrus*, to revenge the Injury done to his Mother *Neitetic*, whom *Amasis* put upon *Cyrus* for his own Daughter ; but she was the Daughter of *Apries*, whom *Amasis* had de-throned and slain : the Story of *Neitetic* being the Mother of *Cambyfes* is dis-allowed by *Herodotus*, who makes her the Concubine of *Cambyfes*. *Ctesias*

	Year before Christ.	Years of Reign.	Sum collected.	Years of Nabonasar.
3 Darius Son of } Hystaspes (26)	519	— 36	— 264	— 229th
4 Xerxes (27)	483	— 21	— 285	— 265th
[Artabanus, Uncle of Artaxerxes, reigned seven Months, which are added to the Reign of Xerxes.]				
5 Artaxerxes	462	— 41	— 326	— 286th
6 Darius II.	421	— 19	— 345	— 327th
7 Artaxerxes II. } called Mnemon, } (28)	402	— 43	— 388	— 346th

also makes *Cambyses* invade *Egypt* in the Beginning of his Reign; and soon after the Death of *Petifacas*, who was put to Death in the last Year of *Cyrus*, [excerpt. ad fin. Herodot. p. 639] and he adds [ibid. p. 641.] that *Cambyses* died about six Years after: for he saies, that *Cambyses* having killed his Brother *Tanyoxarces*, called *Smerdis* by *Herodotus*, whom he sent for to him into *Egypt*, his Death was not discovered to his Mother *Amysis* till five Years afterward, and *Cambyses* did not live long after this Discovery. Hence it appears, that as *Cambyses* did not reign quite eight Years, he must have begun the *Egyptian War* about the second Year of his Reign.

(26) The Epoch of the Reign of *Cambyses* having been fixed to the Year before *Christ* 527, *Darius* Son of *Hystaspes* must begin to reign in the Year before *Christ* 519. And *Jerome* placeth it in this Year: for he placeth the second Year of *Darius* in the seventeenth Year of *Tarquinius Superbus*, which was the Year before *Christ* 518, so by this Account he began to reign in the Year before *Christ* 519. In the present Copies of *Jerome* it is read, annus vigesimus septimus; but it is evident he wrote *decimus* septimus; for he adds, qui post octo annos expulsus est a Bruto: and all agree, that *Tarquin* reigned no more than twenty-five Years. And *Jerome* computes, agreeably to this Term of his Reign, 464 Years from his Expulsion to *Julius Cesar's* being created Dictator, in the Year before *Christ* 45.

(27) The famous Prophecy of *Daniel's* seventy Weeks, or 490 Years, to the Baptism and Preaching of the Messiah (*Dan.* ch. ix. 24) commenced in the Reign of *Xerxes*, as *Josephus* assures us, and in the twentieth Year of his Reign, as we are told in *Nebemiab*, ch. ii. 1. so it commenced in the Year before *Christ* 464. *Christ* was baptized and began to preach his Gospel, A. D. 28. in the fifteenth Year of *Tiberius Cesar*. Now, 463 Years before the vulgar *Æra* of *Christ*, and twenty-seven Years after it, make exactly 490 Years complete: and it was in the 491st Year after the twentieth of *Xerxes*, when *Christ* was baptized and entered upon his prophetic Office. *Christ* was then thirty Years of Age, and therefore was born two Years at least before the vulgar *Christian Æra*.

(28) See Note, Numb. 8. in the foregoing Canon under this Reign.

	Year before Christ.	Years of Reign.	Sum collected.	Years of Nabonasar.
8 Ocbus	359	21	409	389th
9 Arses	338	2	411	410th
10 Darius III.	336	4	415	412th
11 Alexander M. (29)	332	8	423	416th

Kings who reigned after Alexander.

	Year before Christ.	Years of Reign.	Sum collected.	Years of Nabonasar.
1 Philip Aridæus	324	7	430	424th
2 Alexander Ægus	317	12	442	431st

Grecian Kings of Egypt.

	Year before Christ.	Years of Reign.	Sums collected.	Years of Nabonasar.
1 Ptolemy Son of } Lagus	305	20	462	443d
2 Pt. Philadelphus	285	38	500	463d
3 Pt. Euergetes I.	247	25	525	501st
4 Pt. Philopator	222	17	542	526th
5 Pt. Epiphanes	205	24	566	543d
6 Pt. Philometor	181	35	601	567th
7 Pt. Euergetes II.	146	29	630	602d
8 Pt. Soter	117	36	666	631st
9 Dionysius	81	29	695	667th
10 Cleopatra	52	22	717	696th

Kings of the Romans.

	Year before Christ.	Years of Reign.	Sum collected.	Years of Nabonasar.
1 Augustus	30	43	760	718th
2 Tiberius, A. D.	14	22 m. 6. d. 26.	782	761st
3 Caius	37	3 m. 10. d. 8.	786	784th
4 Claudius	41	13 m. 8. d. 20.	800	788th
5 Nero	54	13 m. 7. d. 28.	813	801st
6 Galba	68	m. 7. d. 7.	814	815th

(29) See Note, N. 10. in the foregoing Canon.

	<i>Year before Christ.</i>	<i>Years of Reign.</i>	<i>Sum collect.</i>	<i>Years of Nabonafar.</i>
7 <i>Otho</i>	69	—	m. 3. d. 2.	815 — 816th
8 <i>Vitellius</i>	69	—	m. 8. d. 5.	815 — 816th
9 <i>Vespasian</i>	69 (ending)	10	—	825 — 816th
10 <i>Titus</i>	79	2	m. 2. d. 20.	828 — 826th
11 <i>Domitian</i>	81	15	d. 6.	843 — 828th
12 <i>Nerva</i>	96	1	m. 4. d. 11.	844 — 843d
13 <i>Trajan</i>	98	19	m. 6. d. 15.	863 — 845th
14 <i>Adrian</i>	117	21	m. 10. d. 28.	885 — 864th
15 <i>Antoninus Pius</i>	138	23	—	908 — 886th

The Canon ended A. D. 161. and in the Year of *Nabonafar* 909.

Concerning the River of Egypt.

THE River of Egypt, frequently mentioned in Scripture as the Boundary between *Palestine* and *Egypt*, hath been generally thought to be a little Rivulet, which runs by *Rhinocolura* [or as it is also, but not so properly, called *Rhinocorura*] not far from *Raphia*, into the *Mediterranean* Sea. Others think this River to be the *Nile*, which is the only River belonging to *Egypt*. For the first Opinion it may be said, that the *Greek* Interpreters of the Bible render the Stream, or River of Egypt, by *Rhinocorura*, *Esai.* ch. xxvii. 12. and therefore though *Pelufium* was properly the Beginning and Entrance of *Egypt* from *Palestine*, yet the River near *Rhinocolura* might be reckoned the Boundary between them; because the Land lying between that River and *Pelufium* was desert and uninhabited, though it was a Country of ninety Miles in Length, according to the Itinerary of *Antoninus*. And agreeably to this, the Septuagint in *Jos.* ch. xiii. 3. instead of *from Si-bor which is before Egypt*, have *from the uninhabited Country which is before Egypt*, placing the Boundary at *Rhinocolura*, which adjoined to the Desert of *Arabia*. It is also certain, that *Rhinocolura* was anciently esteemed to be a City belonging (1) to *Egypt*. And Dio-

(1) *Diod. Sic.* lib. i. p. 70. *Strab. Geog.* lib. xvi. p. 1102. where he assigns the Reason of the Name agreeably to the Account of *Diodorus*: but he makes it a City of *Phanicia* on the Border of *Egypt*. *ibid.* p. 1128. *Stepha-dorus*

dorus Siculus (2) saies, it was situated in the Confines of *Egypt* and *Syria* (*Judæa* was reckoned a Part of *Syria*) *Diodorus* gives the Reason of the Name, relating, that *Actisanes* King of *Æthiopia* having possessed himself of *Egypt*, partly by Force, and partly by the voluntary Submission of the *Egyptians*, cleared the Country of Robbers who had infested it, by an extraordinary Method : for having got them together, he cut off their Noses, and banished them into the furthest Part of the Defart, which was in the Confines of *Egypt* and *Syria*, and there built them a City to dwell in, which was called *Rhinocolura*, from the Punishment which was inflicted upon the Robbers. And by this Account the Defart, as far as *Rhinocolura*, belonged to *Egypt*.

For the Opinion that the River of *Egypt* means the *Nile*, the learned Dr. *Shaw* useth the following Arguments : He saies (3), “ that it does “ not appear from the ancient Geography, sacred or profane, that *Rhinocolura*, or any City of Note in that Situation, was known till many “ Ages after the Time of *Joshua*. Neither (he adds) do we learn from “ *Strabo*, *Mela*, *Ptolemy*, *Pliny*, or any other of the old Geographers, “ who have described these Parts, that any River or Torrent, after “ *Rhinocolura* was built, did empty itself there into the Sea.—That “ no River here is taken notice of by Travellers who have passed along “ this Coast. Nay, (4) *Diodorus Siculus* represents *Rhinocolura*. (he “ calls it *Rhinocolura*) to be built in a Defart, where there was no Wa-

mus of *Byzantium* calls it a City of *Egypt*, in voc. Euseb. in Onomastico, and others.

(2) *Diod. Sic. sup. Chron. Paschal.* p. 30. See *Had. Reland. Palæstin. de Rhinocolura*, lib. iii. p. 969—971. also lib. i. p. 285, 286. see also *Cellar. Geog. Antiq.* lib. iii. c. 13. p. 518, 519. And *Augustin*, speaking of the Country which God had promised to *Abraham's* Seed, saies, it did not extend from the great River of *Egypt*, i. e. the *Nile* : but from a little River which is the Boundary between *Egypt* and *Palestine*, where the City *Rhinocolura* is situated, unto the great River *Euphrates*, *De Civ. Dei*, lib. xvi. c. 24.

(3) Supplement to his Travels, ch. iii. p. 21, 22, 23.

(4) Lib. i. p. 17. *Wessel.* See his Note on the Place, Numb. 40. but *Strabo* relates, from *Eratosthenes*, that there was a River which ran into the Sea near *Rhinocolura*. See *Reland's Palæst.* lib. i. cap. 45. and the Septuagint Version of *Isaiab*, ch. xxvii. 12. supposes the same.

“ter. *Herodotus* (5) confirms this Account ; by telling us, that in those
 “ Deserts the Country is in grievous Want of Water, to the Distance
 “ of three Days Journey from Mount *Cafius*, or the *Sirbonic Lake*.”
 He concludes, “ there appears then little Reason for fixing so remarka-
 “ ble a Boundary as that of the Holy Land, in a wild open Desert,
 “ which had neither City, River, Torrent, or, as far as we know,
 “ any remarkable Landmark to distinguish it. He thinks that the
 “ Septuagint, in translating *Nabal Mizraim* the River of Egypt, *Isai*.
 “ ch. xxvii. 12. by *Rhinocorura*, might be probably owing to a Mistake,
 “ because in their Time it was a Place of great Note and Traffick ;
 “ and they might conclude it to have been, in the Time of *Joshua*, a
 “ frontier City of Egypt.” And it is observable, that this is the only
 Place where they so render it. They translate it, *the Gulph of Egypt*,
Josh. xv. 4. the River of Egypt, *1 Kings viii. 65. Gen. xv. 18. the*
Torrent of Egypt, *2 Chron. vii. 8. 2 Kings xxiv. 7. Numb. xxxiv. 5.*
Jos. xv. 47.

Dr. *Shaw* further observes (p. 26.) “ that upon the Supposition that
 “ there was a Torrent, or Rivulet at *Rhinocorura*, yet with what Pro-
 “ priety could this be called *the River of Egypt* ; a Country with which
 “ it hath no Communication, no Part of which it waters ?” And in-
 deed, as the *Nile* was the proper and only River of Egypt, there seems
 to be no Reason to think, that any other River would be so called : So
 that the *River of Egypt* does as properly and emphatically mean the
Nile, as the *Land of Egypt* means the Country itself of Egypt, and no
 other. The learned Doctor also remarks, “ that *Rhinocorura* was a
 “ Part of the Land of the *Philistines*, and not of Egypt ; and that
 “ Egypt was the Country which lay within the Extent of the *Nile* :
 “ what (6) was beyond on the West Side was called *Libya*, and on the
 “ East Side *Arabia*.”

(5) Lib. iii. c. 5. p. 163. But *Herodotus* saies, all the Desert, or Country,
 from the *Serbonic Lake*, belonged to Egypt, *ibid*.

(6) *Arabia* conterminum claritatis magnæ solis oppidum, *Plin. Nat. Hist.*
lib. v. c. 9. Ultra Pelusiacum ostium Arabia est, Ibid. c. xi. Alexandria a
magno Alexandro condita in Africae parte ab ostio Canopico 12 Millia, Ibid.
c. x. Herodotus, lib. ii. c. 15. is of the same Opinion. But still he reckons

The learned Foreigners, (7) *David Mill* and (8) *John Clerk*, agree with Dr. *Shaw's* Opinion: and the following Observation seems to confirm the Truth of it. *Joshua*, mentioning the Boundary of the Holy Land, which was to be from the River of *Egypt* Northward, thus describes it, ch. xiii. 3. *From Sihor which is before Egypt, even unto the Borders of Ekron Northward.* And that *Sihor* is that which is in other Places called *the River of Egypt*, is evident from the following Texts: *David* is said to gather all *Israel* together from *Sihor of Egypt* even unto the entering in of *Hamath* (in *Syria*) 1 *Chron.* xiii. 5. and in the parallel Places, 1 *Kings* viii. 65. and 2 *Chron.* vii. 8. it is expressed—*from the entering in of Hamath unto the River of Egypt.* So *Sihor* in one Place, and the *River of Egypt* in the others, are the same. And that *Sihor* is the Name of the River *Nile*, is evident from the Words of the Prophet; *And now what hast thou to do in the Way of Egypt, to drink the Waters of Sihor? Or what hast thou to do in the Way of Assyria, to drink the Waters of the River?* (*Euphrates*) *Jerem.* ch. ii. 18. Here the *Nile* is plainly called *Sihor*. In *Gen.* ch. xv. 18. the Boundary of the Land, promised by God to the Seed of *Abraham*, is said to be *from the River of Egypt unto the great River, the River Euphrates.* Now it can hardly be supposed, that a Boundary of a Nation would be set from so small a Rivulet as that at *Rhinocolura*, to so great and famous a River as that of *Euphrates*. The *Nile* therefore is *the River of Egypt*, called so probably from the Hebrew Word *Nihal*, which signifies a River; because it was emphatically *the River* which ran through and watered *Egypt*, the Land of *Mizraim*. It was called *Sihor*, from the Muddiness and Blackness of its Waters: the Word *Sihor* signifying that which is *muddy* or *black*. And the *Æthiopians* called it (9) *Siris* for the same Reason. It was on the same Account

all the Country from the *Serbonic Lake* to belong to *Egypt*, lib. iii. c. 5. p. 163. And *Ptolemy* makes *Cassium* the *Serbonic Lake*, *Ostracine*, *Rhinocorura*, and *Anthedon*, to lie all within the *Cassiotic Division* of *Egypt*, *Geog.* lib. iv. p. 103. So that the Territories of *Egypt* (though not *Egypt* properly so called) extended anciently as far as *Rhinocolura*.

(7) *Mill. Dissertat. de Nilo et Euphrate. Traject. ad Rhen. 1724.*

(8) *Comment. in Jos. c. xiii. 3.*

(9) *Dionys. Perieg. v. 223.*

called *Melo* (10), and *Melas*, by the *Greeks* and *Latins*: and *Diodorus Siculus* observes, that the most ancient Name of the *Nile* was *Okeames* (11), whence *Homer* called it *Oceanus*, and *Diodorus* thought, that the *Egyptians* meant by it the same as the *Greek*, *Oceanus*; and *Herodotus* takes notice, that *Homer* called the *Nile* *Oceanus*, but knew not the Reason of it. But it was probably called *Okeames*, from the *Egyptian* Word *Okema* [כְּמָה] or *Okem*, which signified *black*, and is used in that Sense in the *Syriac* and *Chaldee* Language; and hence the *Greeks* called it *Chemia*, So it was the same as *Sibor*, or *Siris*. And as *Sibor*, and the *River of Egypt*, are the same, and *Sibor* has been fully proved to be the *Nile*, it follows, that the *River of Egypt*, mentioned so often to be a Boundary of the Holy Land, is no other than the famous *River Nile*: as the Boundary on the North-east was the great *River Euphrates*: and so *Philo Judæus* understands it, *De Somn.* p. 1143.

A Chronological Dissertation on the Time on the Septuagint Greek Version.

THIS Version, which is of inestimable Value, has been generally thought to have been made in the Reign, and by the Order of *Ptolemy Philadelphus* King of *Egypt*, and by the Advice of *Demetrius Phalereus*, who was a most accomplished Scholar and eminent Statesman; and was made the first Keeper of the famous *Alexandrian* Library, in which this Version was laid up. But both ancient and modern Writers,

(10) *Plut.* de *Isid. et Osir.* Serv. in lib. iv. *Georg.* *Virgil.* *Eust.* Com. in *Dionys.* *Perieg.* ad v. 223, etc.

(11) Τὸν [Νεῖλον] ποταμὸν ἀρχαιοτάτου μὲν ὄνομα εἶναι Ωκεάνην, ὃς ἐστὶν Ἑλληνιστὶ ἀρκέανθ. lib. i. p. 22. The learned Editor, *Wesseling*, has published it ἀρκέανθ, which he thinks the true Reading: but ὠκεάνην is more agreeable to its Derivation from *Okem*, or *Okema*; and so is the better Reading. If *Homer* thought the *Greek* Word ἀρκέανθ was derived from the *Coptic* *Okem*, or ἀρκάμες, it will shew the Reason why he calls the Sea, οἶνοπα πόντον, and μέλανα πόντον, the *Black Sea*.

and

and Chronologers disagree about the Year of *Ptolemy's* Reign when the Version was made. *Eusebius's* Chronicon placeth it to the second Year of *Philadelphus*, in *Scaliger's* Edition; and some of *Pontacus's* MSS. of the *Chronicon*, fix it to the first Year of his Reign. *Vitruvius*, in the Preface to his seventh Book, saies, that *Ptolemy* collected and composed his Library, to vie with that of the *Attalic* Kings at *Pergamus*. This *Attalic* Library was first instituted by *Eumenes*, who began to reign at *Pergamus* in the twenty-third Year of the Reign of *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, and in the Year before *Christ* 263. And agreeably to this Account, *Syncellus* (1) relates, that *Ptolemy* had the *Greek* Version of the Scriptures made and put into his Library, in the 132d Olympiad, which was the Year before *Christ* 252, and the thirty-fourth Year of *Ptolemy's* Reign. But this Account has no Foundation; and contradicts the whole Stream of History, which ascribes the procuring this Version to be made to the Conduct and Advice of *Demetrius Phalereus*, who died, as will be proved, in the first Year of *Ptolemy Philadelphus*.

That the *Greek* Version of the Books of *Moses* was made in the Reign of *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, and after the Death of his Father *Ptolemy*, Son of *Lagus*, called *Soter*, is built on the Testimony of *Aristæus*, or *Aristæas*, or the History of this Translation, which goes under his Name: and which Account is followed by (2) *Aristobulus*, the *Jewish* Peripatetic Philosopher, who lived in the Reign of *Ptolemy Philometor*; and by (3) *Philo* the *Jew*, (4) *Josephus*, (5) *Justin Martyr*, (6) *Tertullian*, (7) *Eusebius*, and many others. But as they all suppose that *Demetrius Phalereus* had the Management of this Translation, and the Care of the whole Library, this Version of the Law of *Moses*, which was the whole of the *Septuagint* Translation, could not be made

(1) Chronograph. p. 273.

(2) Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. xiii. c. 12.

(3) De Vit. Mos. lib. ii. p. 658.

(4) Antiq. Jud. lib. xii. c. 2.

(5) Ad Græcos Cohort. p. 13, 14. Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 294.

(6) Apolog. adv. Gent. c. xviii.

(7) Præp. Evang. lib. viii. p. 349, 350.

ⁱn any other Part of the Reign of *Philadelphus*, but only in those (8) *two Years* in which he reigned with his Father *Ptolemy Soter*, Son of *Lagus*. For *Hermippus* (9) related, that *Demetrius Phalereus* was banished from the Court of *Alexandria*, and confined by *Ptolemy Philadelphus* in the first Year of his Reign, after the Death of his Father. The Reason of which was, that *Demetrius* had endeavoured to persuade *Ptolemy Soter* to give the Kingdom to his eldest Son *Ceraunus*, whom he had by *Eurydice*, and not to *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, whom he had afterward by *Berenice*. On this Account *Philadelphus*, as soon as he came to the Crown upon his Father's Death, ordered *Demetrius* to be kept in Custody, till he should resolve what to do with him: and he soon after died of the Bite of an Asp, or Viper, whilst he was asleep. This is the Relation of *Diogenes Laertius* from *Hermippus*. *Diogenes* gives another Account of the Disgrace of *Demetrius*, from *Heraclides's* Epitome of *Sotion*, which is, that when *Ptolemy (Soter)* had a mind to deliver the Regency of the Kingdom to *Ptolemy Philadelphus* his Son, and make him Partner with him, *Demetrius* would have dissuaded him from it. Both these Accounts agree, and make it probable, that *Demetrius* fell under the Displeasure of *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, as soon as he had the sole Power and Government upon the Death of his Father. Therefore, if the *Alexandrian* Library was collected, and the Septuagint Version of the Law of *Moses* made, when *Demetrius Phalereus* had the Direction and Care of the Library; and also in the Reign of *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, it must be made in that Space of Time whilst *Ptolemy Philadelphus* reigned with his Father, and in the Year before *Christ* 286, or 287. It was the Opinion of several ancient Writers,

(8) Τῶν δὲ παρῆλθε τὴν ἀρχὴν πρὸ ἰδναίου ἀγαθῆς τῆς τελευτῆς τῷ Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ ἡνὶ Φιλαδέλφῳ δὲ ἐπέλασεν, Lucian. Macrob. p. 914. Φιλαδέλφῳ, ἢ ζῶντος μὲν ἔτι τῷ πατρὶ, δύο πληροὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἔτη ἀποθανόντι δὲ ἔτι καὶ τριάκοντα, Porphyg. apud Euseb. Chron. Gr. p. 59. And *Theocritus*, in his Poem on *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, saies of his Father *Soter*:

ὦ δέ κε παῖσι

Θαράσας ἐφείλοντο ἐπὶ ῥέπει αἶον ἀπαῖα. Idyl. xvii. 40, 41.

The *Scholiast's* Note upon them is: Ζῶν γὰρ ἔτι ὁ Σῶτης ἐκγονοποίησε τῷ Φιλαδέλφῳ τὴν βασιλείαν. See *Cornel. Nepos de Reg. in fin.* and *Justin. lib. xvi. c. 2.*

(9) Vit. Demetrii apud Diog. Laert.

that

that the *Greek* Version of the Septuagint was made in the Reign of *Ptolemy Soter* Son of *Lagus*.

Irenæus (10) saies, that *Ptolemy Son of Lagus*, having a mind to furnish his Library at *Alexandria* with all kind of valuable Books, procured the *Jewish* Scriptures to be translated into *Greek*.

Theodoret, in his Preface to the Psalms, agrees with *Irenæus*, that the Septuagint Translation was made in the Reign of *Ptolemy* Son of *Lagus*: and (11) *John Malala* is express to the same Purpose. *Clemens Alexandrinus* (12) writes, that some ascribed the Septuagint *Greek* Version to the Reign of *Ptolemy* Son of *Lagus*; and others to the Reign of *Ptolemy* called *Philadelphus*. But (13) *Anatolius*, Bishop of

(10) Adv. Hæres. lib. iii. c. 21. p. 215. et apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. v. c. 8.

(11) Chronograph. p. 250.

(12) Ἑρμηνεύειν δὲ τὰς γραφὰς τὰς τε τῶ νόμου καὶ τὰς προφητικὰς ἐκ τῆς τῶν Ἑβραίων διαλέκτου εἰς τὴν ἑλληνικὴν γλῶτταν φασὶν ἐπὶ Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ Λάγῳ· ἢ ὡς τινες, ἐπὶ τῷ Φιλαδέλφῳ ἐπικληθέντι. Strom. i. p. 409, 410.

(13) Μαθεῖν δ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τῶν ὑπὸ Φίλων, Ἰωσήφου, Μυσαίου λεγόμενων, καὶ οὐ μόνον τῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἐπιπαλαιότερων, ἀμφοτέρων Ἀριστοβούλων· τῷ ἐπικλῆν διδασκάλῳ, καὶ Ἀριστοβούλῳ τῷ πάντῳ, ὅς ἐν τοῖς ἑξομήκοντα κατελεγμένῳ τοῖς τὰς ἱερῶν καὶ θείας Ἑβραίων ἐρμηνεύσασιν γραφὰς Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ Φιλαδέλφῳ καὶ τῷ τέτταρτῳ πατρὶ καὶ βίβλου ἐξηγητικὰς τῷ Μωυσέως νόμῳ τοῖς αὐτοῖς προσεφώνησε βασιλεύσιν. Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. c. 32. The Copies of *Eusebius* have, ἀμφοτέρων Ἀγαθοβούλων τῶν ἐπικλῆν διδασκάλων Ἀριστοβούλῳ τῷ πάντῳ, etc. The Passage is evidently corrupt, for we find no mention of so much as one called *Agathobulus*, who was older than *Philo*, or *Josephus*, or *Musaëus*. *Syncellus* mentions an *Agathobulus* in the Reign of *Adrian*, Chronograph. p. 349. but he could not be meant by *Anatolius*. *Eusebius* therefore undoubtedly wrote from *Anatolius*, ἀμφοτέρων Ἀριστοβούλων, etc. as I have corrected the Place. And there were several Writers called *Aristobulus*, who were older than *Philo Judæus*, etc. One of these is mentioned in the second Book of *Maccabees*, ch. i. 10. who is there said to be a *Jewish* Priest, and *Ptolemy's* Master [whence afterward he might be called *Master*, as *Anatolius* saies he was] but then he is said to live in the 188th Year of the Æra of the *Seleucidae*, which Æra commenced in the Year before *Christ* 312. So that there is an Error in the Number; and it was probably the 148th. For this *Aristobulus* was a *Jew*, and a Peripatetic Philosopher, and Tutor to *Ptolemy Philometor*, to whom he dedicated his Exposition of the Law of *Moses*, Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. vii. c. 13. *Clemens Alexandrinus* mentions his first Book, addressed to *Ptolemy Philometor*, Strom. i. p. 410. and *Eusebius* cites what *Clemens* relates, and

Laodicea.

Laodicea, about the Year of *Christ* 270, who was a Man of exquisite Learning, wrote in his *Paschal Canons*, that the Seventy Interpreters made their *Greek* Version of the sacred *Hebrew* Scriptures, for *Ptolemy Philadelphus* and his Father: and that *Aristobulus*, one of them, dedicated his Exposition of the Law of *Moses* to both these Kings. Therefore, as all agree that *Demetrius Phalereus* had the Oversight and Charge of the *Alexandrian* Library, when the Law of *Moses* was translated into *Greek*: and as some Writers ascribe the Ver-

adds further from *Aristobulus*, ἡ δὲ ὅλη ἐρμηνεία τῶν διὰ τὸ νόμον πάντων ἐπὶ τῷ προσ-
αγεσθέντι Φιλαδέλφῳ βασιλεῖ, οὗ δὲ προγόνου — Δημήτριῳ τῷ Φαληρέῳ πραγ-
ματώσαμένῳ τὰ περὶ τούτων, *Præp. Ev. lib. xiii. c. 12.* Here *Aristobulus* sup-
poses the Law of *Moses* to be all that was translated into *Greek*, in the Reign
of *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, and under the Conduct of *Demetrius Phalereus*. And
it is a Mistake in other ancient Writers, who say, that the Law, and also
the prophetic Writings, were then translated. But it is observable, that
Clemens Alexandrinus mentions *Aristobulus* in the Reign of *Ptolemy Philadel-*
phus, and makes him to be that *Aristobulus* who is mentioned in the *second*
Book of Maccabees, *Strom. v. p. 705.* In which last Point he is plainly mis-
taken. And *Eusebius* [*Præp. Evang. lib. viii. c. 8. fin.*] speaks of *Aristobu-*
lus as contemporary with *Eleazar* the High-Priest, who sent the *Hebrew* Copy
of the Law to *Ptolemy Philadelphus*. The learned *Scaliger*, in his *Animadversio-*
ns on the Chronicon of Eusebius, Number 1841. p. 142. thinks, *Anatolius* is
guilty of an Anachronism; and that *Clemens* contradicts himself: but all is
reconcilable together. For it appears (which *Scaliger* was not aware of)
that there were two Writers called *Aristobulus* [and so my Correction of the
Passage from *Anatolius* is confirmed] one of which was called *the Master*,
and was Tutor to *Ptolemy Philometor*: he was a *Jewish* Priest, and a *Peripa-*
tetic Philosopher, and dedicated his Books of the Interpretation of the Laws
of *Moses* to *Ptolemy Philometor*: the other, who was elder, and a *Jew* also,
was one of the Seventy Interpreters; and wrote an Exposition of the allego-
rical Sense of the Law, which he dedicated to *Ptolemy Son of Lagus*, and his
Son Ptolemy Philadelphus, who reigned with him. If *Scaliger* had consid-
ered, or known that *Anatolius* spake of two *Aristobulus*'s, all would have
been plain and easy to him: and he would have seen that *Clemens* did not
contradict himself; but that he was only mistaken in taking the *Aristobulus*,
who was contemporary with *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, and one of the Seventy In-
terpreters, for him who is mentioned in the second Book of *Maccabees*. In
this Book it is said, *χ' 7. what Time as Demetrius reigned in the 169th Year,*
i. e. of the Æra of the Seleucide, used in the Books of the Maccabees. Also
χ' 10. it is said, in the hundred fourscore and eighth Year, the People that were
in Jerusalem and in Judæa, and the Counsel and Judas [Maccabæus] sent greet-
tion

sion to the Reign of *Ptolemy Soter*, Son of *Lagus*; and others to that of *Ptolemy Philadelphus*; and some to both their joint Reigns: and since it appears from the Testimonies of *Hermippus* and *Heraclides*, that *Demetrius* was in Disgrace, and died soon after *Ptolemy Philadelphus* reigned alone upon the Death of his Father; the Septuagint Greek Translation was most probably made in the Year before *Christ* 286, whilst *Ptolemy Soter* was alive, and reigned together with his Son.

ing and Health unto *Aristobulus*, King *Ptolemy's* Master, who was of the Stock of the anointed Priests, and to the Jews that were in Egypt. Both these Numbers are corrupt. The first, which respects the Reign of *Demetrius Soter*, should be 149, for he began to reign in the Year before *Christ* 162, which was the 149th, or rather 150th Year of the *Æra* of the *Seleucidae*: and as he reigned no more than twelve Years to the 161st, or 162d Year of that *Æra*, it is evident that the Number 169 is wrong, and must be amended. The latter Number 188, & 10. should be, I think, 148, which was the Year before *Christ* 163, or 164; and the 19th, or 18th Year of *Ptolemy Philometor*. For the Letter was wrote to thank God for the Death of *Antiochus Epiphanes* their Enemy, who died in the Year before *Christ* 164. As the second Book of *Maccabees* ends in the second Year of *Demetrius*, and in the Year before *Christ* 161. This shews that the Number 188, & 10. which relates to the Time when the Jews wrote to *Aristobulus*, King *Ptolemy's* Master, and which was before they sent this Abridgment of the History of the *Maccabees* to them, must be a wrong Number. And as the Year before *Christ* 161 was the 151st Year of the *Æra* of the *Seleucidae*; the Letter which the Jews had wrote to *Aristobulus* must be dated in a prior Year. Besides, *Ptolemy Philometor* died in the 166th Year of the *Æra* of the *Seleucidae*, and twelve Years before this Letter, according to the Number 188, was supposed to be sent to his Master *Aristobulus*, who probably had been then long dead. Lastly, it is observable that *Judas Maccabæus* is here mentioned with those who wrote then to *Aristobulus*, and to the Jews in Egypt; and he was killed in Battle in the Year before *Christ* 161. So this Letter was wrote upon the Death of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, in the Year before *Christ* 164, or 163, which was the 148th, or 149th Year of the *Æra* of the *Seleucidae*: and the second Book of *Maccabees* was wrote soon after the Death of *Nicanor* and *Judas Maccabæus*, in the Year before *Christ* 160, or thereabout; and *Judas* seems to be spoken of as dead, ch. ii. 14, 19.

A Chronological Dissertation on the Kings of (1) old Tyre, from Abibalus to Pygmalion, from the Phœnician History of Menander of Ephesus, cited in the first Book of Josephus against Apion, Sect. xviii. p. 448, 449.

IN the present Text of *Josephus* from *Menander*, *Hiram*, or *Hiram*, the second King who succeeded his Father *Abibalus*, has no more than thirty-four Years given to his Reign: and this Number (2) *Syncellus* read in *Josephus*; and *Josephus* has it so, [Antiq. Jud. lib. viii. c. 5. p. 434.] and by this Reckoning the Sum of the Years from *Hiram* to *Dido's* fleeing into *Africa* in the seventh Year of *Pygmalion*, and building *Carthage*, is no more than an hundred and thirty-six Years and eight Months. And yet *Josephus* saies that *Menander* made the Sum of the Reigns in this Interval to be an hundred and fifty-five Years and eight Months. *Theophilus* (3), Bishop of *Antioch*, saies the same: and *Syncellus* also computes the same Number of Years; and to make it up, they give more Years to several Reigns than *Josephus* does. The Reigns in *Josephus* want nineteen Years to make up the Sum total of *Menander*; and if these are added to the Reign of *Hiram*, and he reigned fifty-three Years, all will be right. As therefore *Hiram* is said in *Josephus* to have lived fifty-three Years, and to have reigned thirty-four Years; the Number of the Years of his Reign is by Mistake given to the Years of his Life; and *Menander*, from the *Tyrian Annals*, wrote, that *Hiram* reigned fifty-three Years; and he might begin to reign when he was thirty-four Years of Age.

(1) *Josephus*, Antiq. lib. viii. c. 3. reckons from the *Tyrian Annals* two hundred and forty Years from the building of *Tyre* to the founding of *Solomon's* Temple. These he computes to the 12th of *Hiram*, when he supposed the Temple was begun; and this, according to the Series of *Tyrian* Kings, hereafter given, was in the Year before *Christ* 1275, but, according to the true Epoch of the building of the Temple, it was in the Year before *Christ* 1254.

(2) *Chronograph.* p. 183.

(3) *Ad Autolyc.* l. iii.

Now

Now it is certain from the Scripture-History, with which the *Tyrian Annals* remarkably agree, as I have shewn in several Instances, that *Hiram* must have reigned about fifty-three Years: and *Josephus* himself supposed him to reign so long. We read, that after *David* had taken the *Fort of Zion* from the *Jebusites*, and made himself entire Master of *Jerusalem*, about the tenth Year of his Reign, *Hiram* King of *Tyre* sent an Embassy to *David*, and assisted him with Cedar-Trees and Workmen to build him a Palace in *Jerusalem*, 2 *Sam.* ch. v. 11. 1 *Chron.* xiv. 1. And it is evident, that *Hiram* was still living and reigned in the twenty-fourth Year of *Solomon*, when he had finished both the Temple and his own Palace, in which he spent twenty Years.

Hiram probably soon after he came to the Throne sent his Embassy to *David*; and this must be either in the eleventh or twelfth Year of *David's* Reign, as he was living in the twenty-fourth of *Solomon*: and this makes his Reign fifty-two or fifty-three Years. This Term is nearly ascertained from Scripture. *David* had reigned seven Years and six Months at *Hebron*, 2 *Sam.* v. 5. After this in the eighth or Beginning of the ninth Year of his Reign, he besieged *Jerusalem*, and took both the lower and the upper City. This would take up all that Year. In the tenth Year of his Reign he built Walls round the Fort and upper City from *Millo* inward, ¶ 9. The next Year he defeated the *Philistines* in two Battles, ¶ 20, 22, 25. After this, either in the same Year, or Beginning of the twelfth Year of his Reign, *Hiram* sent an Embassy to *David* with Timber of Cedar-Trees and Workmen to build him a Palace. *Josephus* placeth the Embassy of *Hiram* in the twelfth Year of the Reign of *David*. For he computes [*Antiq. Jud.* lib. vii. c. 3.] five hundred and fifteen Years from *Josbua's* dividing the Land of *Canaan* (which was in the forty-sixth Year after the *Israelites* went out of *Egypt*, lib. v. c. 1.) to *David's* taking *Jerusalem* and the Fort of *Zion*, upon which Occasion *Hiram* sent his Embassy.

Now he reckoned five hundred and ninety-two Years between the *Israelites* going out of *Egypt* and the Foundation of *Solomon's* Temple.

This Number is fixt and certain. If we deduct forty-five Years from the foregoing Sum of five hundred and ninety-two, that being the Time from the Exodus to the dividing of the Land, the Remainder will be five hundred and forty-seven Years: and if we deduct from this last Sum thirty-two Years, the Term from the twelfth of *David's* Reign to the building of the Temple in the fourth Year of the Reign of *Solomon*, i. e. twenty-nine Years of *David's* Reign and three of *Solomon's*, the Remainder will be five hundred and fifteen Years; whence it appears that *Josephus* placed *David's* taking of *Jerusalem* and *Hiram's* Embassy to him in the twelfth Year of *David*. And as he with Scripture mentions *Hiram* as reigning in the twenty-fourth Year of *Solomon's* Reign, after he had in the Space of twenty Years finished the Temple and his own Palace, which must be reckoned from the fourth Year of his Reign, as *Josephus* also reckons, [Antiq. Jud. lib. viii. c. 5.] he must suppose *Hiram* to reign fifty-three Years. Thus it appears that the true Number of Years of *Hiram's* Reign, which *Josephus* found in the *Phœnician* History of *Menander*, which was taken from the *Tyrian* Annals, was fifty-three Years. This reconciles the *Tyrian* Annals to themselves, and to the Scripture-History, and to *Josephus's* own Computation above-mentioned. But yet *Josephus*, by a strange Forgetfulness, or Inconsistency, saies, [cont. Apion. lib. i. sect. 17. p. 448.] that in the *Phœnician* Annals of *Tyre* it was recorded, that *Solomon's* Temple was built an hundred and forty-three Years and eight Months before the building of *Cartbage* by the *Tyrians* in the seventh Year of *Pygmalion*; and therefore he saies the Temple was built in the twelfth Year of *Hiram*.

Josephus produces no Evidence from these Annals for what he saies: and in the Passages which he cites from the *Phœnician* History of *Dius* and *Menander* of *Ephesus*, there is not a Word of *Solomon's* Temple mentioned; and it is only said by *Menander*, that in the seventh Year of the Reign of *Pygmalion* his Sister (*Dido*) fled from him into *Africa*, and built *Cartbage*. It was indeed from the twelfth of *Hiram* to the building of *Cartbage*, or the Flight of *Dido*, an hundred and forty-three Years and eight Months, by the Reckoning of *Menander*; but

nothing of the building of the Temple was mentioned in the *Tyrian Annals*, as far as appears : or if the building of it was mentioned, it could not be related to be in the twelfth of *Hiram*. And *Josephus* knew that *Hiram* reigned in the twelfth of *David*, which is utterly inconsistent with the Temple being built (as he saies) in the twelfth of *Hiram*.

From the preceding Observations we may deduce with great Certainty the Epoch of the Kings of *old Tyre*, as follows, viz.

1. <i>Abibalus</i>	—	—	—	[Years not set down.]	—	—
	Years of Reign.				Year before Christ.	
2. His Son <i>Hirom</i> , or (4) <i>Hiram</i>	53	—	—	—	—	1046
3. <i>Balbazar</i> , Son of <i>Hiram</i>	7	—	—	—	—	993
4. <i>Abdastart</i> , Son of <i>Balbazar</i>	9	—	—	—	—	986
5. His Nurse's eldest Son	12	—	—	—	—	977
6. <i>Astart</i> , Son of <i>Delæastart</i>	12	—	—	—	—	965
7. His Brother <i>Aserymus</i>	9	—	—	—	—	953
8. <i>Pheles</i> , Brother of <i>Aserymus</i>	0	—	[8 Months]	—	—	944
9. <i>Ithobal</i> (5), Priest of <i>Astarte</i>	32	—	—	—	—	944
10. His Son <i>Badezor</i> , or <i>Bazor</i>	6	—	—	—	—	912
11. His Son <i>Matgen</i>	9	—	—	—	—	906
12. <i>Pygmalion</i>	47	—	—	—	—	897

Total to *Pygmalion* 149 Years 8 Months, and to the seventh Year of his Reign 155 Years and 8 Months.

(4) *Josephus* relates from *Menander*, that *Hiram*, Son of *Abibalus*, pulled down the old Temples, and built two new ones. which were dedicated to *Hercules* and *Astarte*. The Temple of *Hercules* was built first ; and the *Phœnician* Records were probably laid up in it, *Jos. Antiq. Jud. lib. viii. c. 5.* and cont. *Apion. lib. i. p. 448, 449.* *Hiram* also enlarged *Tyre*, so as to bring the Temple of *Jupiter Olympius*, which stood separate from it, to adjoin to it. *Dius ibid. and cont. Apion. lib. i. p. 448.*

(5) *Ithobal* is the King called *Eth-Baal*, or *Ith-Baal*, in Scripture, *1 Kings xvi. 31.* whose Daughter *Jezebel Abab* married. *Menander* in his History of the Reign of *Ithobal* mentioned the great Drought which happened in *Abab's* Reign ; and which continued a whole Year in *Phœnicia*, *Antiq. Jud. lib. viii. c. 13. p. 458.* The Years of the *Tyrian Annals* agree

This

This agrees exactly to the Account of *Josepbus*, (cont. Apion. lib. ii. p. 469) *that it appeared from the Phœnician Annals that Hirom began to reign more than an hundred and fifty Years before the building of Carthage.*

This is the Computation of *Menander* from the *Tyrian Annals*, which related that in the seventh Year of the Reign of *Pygmalion* his Sister *Dido* fled into *Africa*, and built *Cartbage*; this was in the Year before *Christ* 891, or rather 890. And this is the true *Æra* of *Dido's* Flight, soon after which *Cartbage* was built by the *Tyrians*, who went with her into *Africa*. Modern Chronologers, *Petavius*, Bishop *Llboyd*, and others, following the Mistake of *Josepbus* taken notice of above, have fixed the building of *Cartbage* an hundred and forty-three Years after the Foundation of *Solomon's* Temple: but it appears evident from the *Tyrian Annals*, that *Solomon's* Temple was begun to be built only an hundred and twenty-three Years before *Dido* fled into *Africa*; and in the thirty-third Year of the Reign of *Hiram*. The ancient Writers differed very much in fixing the Epoch of the building of *Cartbage*. *Eusebius* in his *Chronicon*, p. 100. saies it was built an hundred and forty-three Years after the *Trojan War*, that is, in the Year before *Christ* 1040. But he adds, p. 101. that others related that it was built in the Year before *Christ* 1012, which is his Number 1003, according to most of the Manuscripts of *Pontacus*. But this is a gross Anachronism. *Solinus*, c. xxvii. saies *Cartbage* was destroyed seven hundred and thirty-seven Years after it was built (6). It was destroyed in the 608th Year of *Rome*, or in the Year before *Christ* 146. So it was built by this Reckoning in the Year before *Christ* 883, which differs no more than seven or eight Years from the *Tyrian Annals*. *Appian* [de Bell. Pun. p. 135.] wrote that *Cartbage* was destroyed after it had

with those of Scripture: for *Abab* began to reign in the Year before *Christ* 920, which was the 25th of *Itbobal's* Reign; and so *Itbobal* reigned eight Years with *Abab*: and the Drought happened towards the Beginning of *Abab's* Reign, and soon after his Marriage with *Jezebel*, *Itbobal's* Daughter; and so it was in the Reign of *Itbobal*.

(6) Other Copies of *Solinus* had seven hundred Years; and others six hundred and seventy-seven.

been

been built seven hundred Years (7). And this was the Reckoning of *Livy* [Epitom. lib. li.] *Eusebius* in another Part of his Chronicon, p. 147. placeth the Destruction of *Carthage* in the Year before *Christ* 146. and, as some reckoned, seven hundred and forty-eight Years after it was built, by which Computation it was built in the Year before *Christ* 894. This differs but three or four Years from the *Tyrian Annals*: but *Eusebius* himself seems to have thought it was built in the Year before *Christ* 814. Other Writers fixed the *Æra* of the building of *Carthage* in other Years. *Theophilus*, Bishop of *Antioch*, in his third Book to *Autolycus*, saies, it appears from the *Tyrian Records* that the Temple was built an hundred and thirty-four Years and eight Months before *Carthage*. By this Reckoning *Carthage* was built in the Year before *Christ* 880. *Josephus*, as I before observed, inferred from the *Tyrian Annals* that the Temple was built an hundred and forty-three Years and eight Months before *Carthage*: and it is plain that both he and *Theophilus* deduced their several Numbers of Years from the *Tyrian Annals*, by fixing the building of the Temple to different Years of the Reign of *Hiram*. *Josephus* placed it in the twelfth and *Theophilus* in the twenty-second Year of his Reign; and they reckoned to the seventh of *Pygmalion* and the building of *Carthage* from these Epochs; and this was all the Pretence they had to say that the *Tyrian* or *Phœnician Annals* had fixed the building of the Temple to this or that Year before the building of *Carthage*: though the Time of the building of the Temple was not mentioned in those Annals. Chronologers were not aware of this: but by comparing those Annals, which undoubtedly were correct, with the Scripture-History, it is certain that the Flight of *Dido*, and the building of *Carthage*, or the *Byrsa*, which was the Castle, was, as observed above, in the Year before *Christ* 891, or 890, and there is no room for any farther Variation in this Point of Chronology (8).

(7) But *Appian*, in the Beginning of his History of the *Punic Wars*, relates, that the *Romans* took *Sicily* and *Sardinia* from the *Carthaginians* seven hundred Years after the building of *Carthage*. These were taken in the first *Punic War*, and in the Year before *Christ* 232. So, by this Reckoning, *Carthage* was built in the Year before *Christ* 932.

(8) Hence it is evident, that *Virgil* in his *Æneid*, making *Dido* contemporaneous
Kings

Kings of Insular Tyre, after Ithobal the last King of Old Tyre, transcribed from the Phœnician History of Philostratus, by Josephus, lib. i. cont. Apion. p. 452.

	Years of Reign.	Year before Christ.
1. <i>Ithobal</i> ——— ——— ———	19	590
2. <i>Baal</i> ——— ——— ———	10	571
3. After <i>Baal</i> Judges ruled, the first of which was <i>Ecnibal</i>	0 [2 Months]	561
4. <i>Cbelbes</i> ——— ——— ———	0 [10 Months]	561
5. <i>Abbar</i> , High Priest ———	0 [3 Months]	560
6. <i>Mytgon</i> and <i>Gerastratus</i> , Judges	6	560
7. Kings again, <i>Balator</i> ———	1	554
8. <i>Merbal</i> ——— ——— ———	4	553
9. His Brother <i>Hirom</i> ———	20	549

rary with *Æneas*, has fallen into an Anachronism of about three hundred Years : and so his whole Relation concerning them is not only mere Fiction, but an absolute Impossibility : and, I think, is a Blemish in this Prince of the *Latin* Poets. Whether *Virgil* was aware of so great a Metachronism in his Poem, may be questioned. But some learned Persons, thinking he was too judicious and learned to make so great a Mistake in Point of Chronology, have vainly endeavoured to reconcile his Narration to possible Truth and Fact, by supposing that the War and Destruction of *Troy* happened as late or later than the Building of *Cartbage* by *Dido* ; as it must be, to reconcile *Virgil's* Account of *Æneas's* conversing with *Dido* at *Cartbage*. The great Sir *I. Newton* has placed the taking of *Troy* so low as to make it probable that *Æneas* was alive when *Dido* reigned at *Cartbage* ; having fixed the *Æra* of *Troy* to the Year before Christ 904, and the building of *Cartbage* by *Dido* at the Year before Christ 883. But as Sir *Isaac* has brought the taking of *Troy* two hundred and eighty, or two hundred and seventy-nine Years too low, as is certain from the most accurate Computation of the Time of it made by the most learned ancient *Greek* and *Roman* Writers : so Sir *Isaac* should have observed that *Virgil* himself, by his own express Reckoning, makes *Troy* to have been taken about the Year before Christ 1090, which is two hundred and seven Years before the building of *Cartbage* by his Computation. For *Virgil* saies, that after the three Years Reign of *Æneas*, which was four Years after his coming into *Italy*, and seven from the taking of *Troy*, and the thirty Years Reign of his Son *Ascanius*, the *Trojan* Race were to reign three hundred Years to the building of *Rome* by *Romulus*, (*Æn.* lib. i. v. 272, etc.) which all know was in the Year before

In

In the seventh Year of *Ithobal*, and the Year before *Christ* 584, *Nabuchadnezzar* laid Siege to *Tyre*, and took it after a Siege of thirteen Years, [Antiq. Jud. lib. x. c. 11. p. 538.] in the Year before *Christ* 571. And in the fourteenth Year of *Hirom*, and the Year before *Christ* 536, *Cyrus* took *Babylon*, as *Josephus* relates; and the whole Term from the Siege of *Tyre* in the seventh of *Ithobal*, as *Josephus* reckons (whence it appears that *Ithobal* reigned nineteen Years) to the End of the Reign of *Hirom* is by the *Tyrian Annals* fifty-four Years and three Months; which supposes the Siege to begin in the End of the seventh of *Ithobal*, and that *Tyre* was taken in the thirteenth Year of the Siege. And it is the same Term from *Ithobal* to the fourteenth of *Hirom*.

The taking of *Babylon* by *Cyrus* in the fourteenth Year of the Reign of *Hirom* agrees in a very exact and remarkable manner with the Prophecies and Relations of Scripture concerning the seventy Years of the *Babylonish* Captivity of the *Jewish* Nation. For from the first Year of *Nabuchadnezzar* in the Year before *Christ* 604, when *Judæa* was invaded by him, and many Captives taken and carried to *Babylon*, to the second Year of *Cyrus*, when the *Jews* returned to *Judæa*, in the Year before *Christ* 535, or the Beginning of 534, just seventy Years were either ending or completed. And this proves that *Ptolemy's* Canon is deficient by two Years in this Interval, as I have shewn in the foregoing Work.

Christ 753, by *Varro's* Reckoning: and *Cato* and others brought this *Æra* no more than a Year or two lower. So that, to make *Virgil's* Synchronism of *Dido* and *Æneas* more consistent, it is better to suppose that *Virgil* carried the building of *Carthage* many Years higher than it really was; and might not know but that it was nearly contemporary with the War of *Troy*. *Eusebius* in his Chronicon, as I have observed, saies, that some ancient Writers placed the building of *Carthage* in the Year before *Christ* 1040, p. 100. and *Virgil* might place it as high, or higher: though after all, as *Virgil* could not but know the *Æra* of the *Trojan* War, as in his Time agreed on from the most exact Calculations and best historical Evidence, so great a Metachronism as he has adopted in his most excellent Poem, is scarce excusable.

End of the First Volume.

A D D E N D A.

Ad *Pag.* 71, *Not.* (15), after *Edit. Oxon.* p. 1027.

The old and first Edition of Clemens ex Biblioth. Medicea, Florent. 1550. confirms the true Reading which I have given, Ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ ἄρχεται ἡ πέμπτη ἔτις Δημητρίῳ βασιλείᾳ· Πτολεμαίῳ τὸ δωδεκάτον βασιλεύοντι Αἰγυπτίῳ, etc.

Page 361, at the End of *Not.* (18).

Origen, in his Commentary on *Ezech.* i. 1. understands the thirtieth Year mentioned by the Prophet to be the thirtieth Year of his Age. τὰ δὲ τριάκοντα ἔτη—ἐστὶν ὁ χρόνος τῆς ζωῆς ἧς προφήτεται. *Edit. Ruæ.* tom. iii. p. 406.

Ad *Pag.* 445, 446, *Not.* (24).

In the *Attic Æra* of the *Marm. Oxon.* l. 59. *Darius* began to reign in the Year 256 (as the Number ought to be, and not 253, as the Edition has it) before the latest Date of the Marble, which is in the Year before *Christ* 264, and so his Reign commenced in the Year 520 before the *Christian Æra*. *Xerxes*, his Son, began to reign in the Year before *Christ* 487, which was in the Year of the Marble 223, l. 64. though the Number is erased. But this latter Number 223 is confirmed by the preceding Number 227, which mentions the Battle at *Marathon*, which was four Years before the Death of *Darius*: and it is also confirmed from Number 217, (l. 67.) under which the Fleet of *Xerxes* in the *Hellepont*, the Battle at *Thermopylae*, and the Sea-fight near *Salamis*, are placed, that is, in the Year before *Christ* 481, which *Herodotus* relates to have been in the seventh Year of *Xerxes*. By these two Numbers, viz. 256 and 223, restored to the Marble, *Darius* reigned thirty-three Years nearer the Truth than the Editions of the Marble place him: and this also in consequence of *Darius* reigning thirty-six Years, according to the Testimony of *Herodotus*, the *Ptolemaic Canon*, *Manetho*, and other ancient Writers, will bring the Epoch of the Reign of *Xerxes* to the Year before *Christ* 484, and three Years lower than the Marble places it: and this or the following Year I think to be the Truth.

ERRATA.

E R R A T A.

Pag. line	Pag. line
16, 32. <i>read</i> omnium rerum.	199, 21. <i>Daorius</i> —S for 10.
22, 1. — Companions. <i>with a full Stop.</i>	204, 3. Wives.
26, 28. — τὸδε <i>with a Colon.</i>	209, 38. ιχθύς.
36, 18. — <i>Mathusalab</i> , and so throughout.	219, 33. et eos.
— antepen. <i>read</i> Septuagint (whose Number, etc. <i>with a Parenthesis.</i>	221, penult. ἦν.
39, 31. r. <i>Martianau.</i>	234, 36. <i>read</i> calls <i>Labynitus.</i>
44, 29. <i>read</i> movet for monet.	235, not. (82) εἴ. i. e. 190.
47, 18. r. ἐπομβείαν.	237, 2. <i>read</i> <i>Nabonidus.</i>
60, 32. δὲ for δῆ.	244, not. (9) l. 2. κς for κε.
— 34. αἰόντες <i>with an Aspirate.</i>	245, — 9. λς. 36.
— 36. ἀκαταλλήλας.	253, 4. is 1305 Years.
63, 30. Ἀγαποσίων ὦν.	266, 12. <i>Scaliger</i> (60) and l. 27. <i>dele</i> (60).
72, 27. <i>dele</i> Jews.	280, ult. <i>read</i> MSS.
74, 30. r. counted in.	297, 1. <i>dele</i> Syrians of <i>Zobab</i> whom.
75, 31. <i>read</i> Οὐεῖν for Ουεῖν.	298, 27. <i>read</i> Year (13).
77, 30. r. universally received.	305, 25. r. (25) for (17).
78, 18. <i>after</i> Years <i>add</i> to the Birth of <i>Abraham.</i>	308, 11. r. <i>the</i> References (23) (24).
ibid. penult. r. xxix. for ix.	312, 29. <i>read</i> (28).
79, 27. <i>read</i> no more than.	313, 33. r. (28) for (21).
81, 28. r. p. 53. for 530.	332, penult. (59) for (56).
97, 24, lib. vii. for lib. viii.	338, 32. p. 366. for 396.
ibid. 25. ἐπὶ αὐτῷ for ἐπὶ αὐτῶν.	339, 2. ii. 7. for 17.
110, 36. Ἀγαλλάττον.	— 10. 828. for 128.
111, 20. anecdot.	344, 30. <i>Magdolum.</i>
117, 25. נ״פ with a Nun.	345, 12. <i>Circuitium.</i>
140, 1. ancient for Christian.	446, 14. lib. vii. c. 7, 20.
145, 1. r. 1, 5. for 15.	447, 9. r. 2. <i>Alexander.</i>
185, col. 2. l. 19. r. these Years.	451, 4. <i>Otho.</i> <i>with a full Point.</i>
188, l. 10. <i>read</i> from him for his.	— Aug. 6. in his Reign etc.
189, 14. xxxvi. 9. for xxxvi. 2.	454, ult. r. Numb. 27.
190, 14. thing for think.	455, ult. Numb. 29.
198, 3. the (6) Flood.	457, not. (4) r p. 70. for 7.
	460, 7. נחמא for נחמא.
	— 16 Time of.
	462, not. (8) Zōn δὲ.

More ADDITIONS to the first Volume.

Page 108, l. 17. after Hebrew Letters. add, But the Similitude of the Hebrew Letters, mentioned above, may have caused the Difference of the present Hebrew Copies from the Samaritan, which latter has retained its own Reading: and not, that the Samaritan Copy differs from the Hebrew, because the Samaritan Copiers used a Masoret Hebrew Copy. Most of the Differences of the Masoret Hebrew, both from the Samaritan and Greek Texts, might easily arise, not from the Similitude of the Hebrew Letters, but only from the similar Sound of several of the Letters. For in transcribing, it is probable that one read, and another wrote. This will account for most of the Differences pretended to have risen from the Similitude of the present Hebrew Letters; as if the Septuagint Greek Interpreters, and ancient Samaritans also, used these Letters; which is a Fiction, for which there is not the least Evidence.

Page 258, l. 30, 31. add, And some thought that this was also the Belus who reigned at Babylon.

Page 298, l. 27. add, (13).

INDEX of Texts of Scripture, cited and explained in the first Volume.

Gen.

CH. i. 1, 2. p. 2, 48.
 3, 4, 5. p. 3.
 8, 13. p. 4.
 14—19. p. 5.
 20. p. 11.
 28. p. 31.
 31. p. 5.
 Ch. ii. 2. p. 12.
 8, 9. p. 20.
 19. p. 11.
 Ch. iii. 21. p. 31.
 Ch. iv. 2. p. 31.
 3—8, 10, 11. p. 32.
 4, 6, 7. p. 33.
 8. p. 106.
 13—17. p. 34.
 17. p. 232.
 22. p. 206.
 26. p. 35.
 Ch. vi. 1, 4. p. 63.
 2. p. 60.
 2, 4. p. 205.
 2, 6. p. 35.
 4. p. 203, 205.
 11, 12, 13. p. 204.
 Ch. vii. 2. p. 31.
 6. p. 46.
 11. p. 28, 46, 47, 211.
 12. p. 48.
 24. p. 48.
 Ch. viii. 1. p. 49.
 7—13. p. 212.
 13, 14. p. 47.
 20. p. 212.
 Ch. xi. 15. p. 224.
 28. p. 213.
 Ch. x. 8, 9, 10. p. 229.
 10. p. 214, 223.
 11. p. 230, 313.
 Ch. xi. 1—4. p. 223.
 8. p. 227.
 10. p. 51. 76.
 32. p. 100.

Gen.

Ch. xii. 1. p. 101, 102.
 1—5. p. 170.
 4, 5. p. 100.
 Ch. xiv. 1, 2. p. 269.
 1, 4. p. 260.
 16, 18, 20. p. 270.
 Ch. xv. 18. p. 275, 290, 294, 458,
 459.
 Ch. xvii. 17. p. 127.
 Ch. xxii. 20—23. p. 419.
 Ch. xxiii. 16. p. 115.
 Ch. xxiv. 10. p. 285.
 Ch. xxv. 23. p. 290.
 26. p. 127.
 Ch. xxvii. 29, 37, 40. p. 290.
 Ch. xxviii. 2, 7. p. 285.
 Ch. xxix. 5. p. 419.
 20—27, 32. p. 128.
 33—35. p. 129.
 Ch. xxx. 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18.
 p. 129.
 19—26. p. 130.
 25, 26. p. 127.
 Ch. xxxi. 18, 20, 24. p. 285.
 38, 41. p. 131.
 Ch. xxxiii. 17, 18. p. 131.
 Ch. xxxv. 9. p. 285.
 18. p. 131.
 Ch. xxxvi. 35, 39. p. 289.
 Ch. xli. 41. p. 127.
 Ch. xliii. 8. p. 131.
 Ch. xliv. 33. p. 131.
 Ch. xlvi. 11. p. 132.
 21. p. 131, 419.
 Ch. xlvii. 1. p. 332, 333.
 9. p. 127, 131.
 Ch. l. 22, 26. p. 130.

Exod.

Ch. ii. 18. p. 419.
 Ch. iii. 1. p. 419.
 11. p. 293.
 Ch. iv. 18. p. 419.
 Ch. vi. 16. p. 129.

INDEX of Texts of Scripture.

Exod.

- Ch. vi. 18, 20. p. 132.
 23. p. 173.
 Ch. vii. 7. p. 132.
 Ch. viii. 20—23. p. 105.
 Ch. xii. 40. p. 107.
 Ch. xviii. 1. p. 419.
 Ch. xxiii. 16. p. 29.
 Ch. xxviii. 25, 26. p. 293.

Lev.

- Ch. xvii. 4. p. 106.
 Ch. xxiii. 34. p. 28.
 Ch. xxv. 3, 4, 10, 11, 21. p. 326.
 9. p. 28.
 10. p. 325.
 13, 24, 31. p. 327.

Numb.

- Ch. i. 7. p. 171.
 Ch. ii. 3. p. 171.
 Ch. iv. 3, etc. p. 361.
 14. p. 106.
 Ch. x. 29. p. 419.
 Ch. xiii. 1. p. 55, 56.
 6. p. 134.
 Ch. xiv. 32, 33, 34. p. 385.
 Ch. xx. 14. p. 332, 333.
 Ch. xxi. 24, 25. p. 170.
 Ch. xxiv. 17, 18. p. 290.
 Ch. xxix. 1. p. 28.
 Ch. xxxii. 33. p. 105.
 Ch. xxxiv. 5. p. 458.

Deut.

- Ch. i. 6, 7, 8. p. 104.
 9—18. p. 105.
 Ch. xi. 24. p. 275, 290.
 Ch. xv. p. 327.
 Ch. xxiii. 4. p. 285.
 Ch. xxxii. 8. p. 9.

Joshua.

- Ch. i. 4. p. 275, 290.
 Ch. ii. 1. p. 172.
 Ch. vii. 18, 24. p. 419.

Joshua.

- Ch. xiii. 3. p. 456, 459.
 Ch. xiv. 7, 10. p. 133.
 Ch. xv. 4, 47. p. 458.
 Ch. xvii. 11. p. 344.
 Ch. xxiii. 1. p. 134.
 Ch. xxiv. 2. p. 90, 101, 236.
 29. p. 293.

Jud.

- Ch. i. 27. p. 344.
 Ch. ii. 7, 10, 11. p. 136, 137.
 Ch. iii. 6—11. also 14, 30, 31. p. 138.
 6, 8, 10. p. 137.
 8. p. 135, 285.
 Ch. iv. 1, 2, 3. p. 139.
 11. p. 419.
 Ch. v. 6, 31. p. 139.
 Ch. vi. 1. p. 139.
 Ch. viii. 28. p. 139.
 Ch. ix. 22, etc. p. 139.
 Ch. x. 2, 3, 8. p. 139.
 Ch. xi. 13—26. p. 170.
 Ch. xii. 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14. p. 139.
 Ch. xiii. 1. p. 139.
 Ch. xv. 20. p. 139, 146, 152.
 Ch. xvi. 23. p. 209.
 Ch. xvii. 6. p. 136.
 Ch. xviii. 1. p. 136.
 Ch. xix. 1. p. 136.
 Ch. xx. 2, 28. p. 136.
 Ch. xxi. 25. p. 136.
 Ch. xxiv. 29. p. 137.
 33. p. 136.

Ruth.

- Ch. i. 1. p. 173.
 Ch. iv. 21, 22. p. 171, 173.

1 Sam.

- Ch. iii. 1. p. 142.
 Ch. iv. 15. p. 142.
 18. p. 140.
 Ch. v. 2, 3, 4. p. 209.

Ch. vi.

I N D E X of Texts of Scripture.

1 Sam.

- Ch. vi. 1. p. 142.
 vii. 1, 2, 5, 6. p. 142.
 viii. 1—5. p. 142.
 15. p. 143.
 ix. 2. p. 144.
 xi. 14, 15. p. 141.
 xii. 3. p. 367.
 xiii. 1, 2, 3. p. 145.
 xiv. 3. p. 174.
 18. p. 174.
 47. p. 287.
 49. p. 144.
 xxii. 20. p. 174.
 xxv. 2, 4, 5, 15, 16, 42. p. 151.
 xxvi. 1, 7, 12. p. 151.
 xxvii. 2, 6. p. 151.
 7. p. 152.

2 Sam.

- Ch. i. 1. p. 152.
 ii. 10, 11. p. 144, 145.
 v. 5. p. 145.
 5—9. p. 120.
 6—9, 11, 17—25. p. 289.
 5, 9, 20, 22, 25. p. 467.
 11. p. 467.
 viii. 1. p. 290.
 3. p. 287.
 3, 4. p. 297.
 3—8. p. 290, 296.
 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14. p. 290.
 25. p. 297.
 x. 6—19. p. 291.
 16. p. 289.
 xi. 1. p. 293.
 27. p. 292.
 xii. 18. p. 292.
 24, 29—31. p. 293.
 xxi. 15. p. 297.

1 Kings.

- Ch. ii. 9. p. 292.
 iii. 1. p. 292.
 iv. 21, 24. p. 294.

1 Kings.

- Ch. vi. 1. p. 28, 120, 133, 145—
 148.
 38. p. 167.
 vii. 1. p. 167.
 viii. 65. p. 458, 459.
 ix. 10. p. 161.
 26. p. 310.
 xi. 3, 4. p. 297.
 14, 15, 25. p. 290.
 23, 24, 25. p. 296, 297.
 24. p. 295.
 25. p. 297.
 xiv. 15, 16. p. 313.
 21. p. 292, 293.
 xv. 10, 12. p. 419.
 17—22. p. 299.
 18, 20. p. 311.
 33. p. 298.
 xvi. 8. p. 298.
 31. p. 469.
 xx. 1, 20, 21, 29, 30, 33, 34.
 p. 299.
 xxii. 1. p. 299.

2 Kings.

- Ch. viii. 12. p. 300.
 15. p. 299.
 xiii. 7, 17, 25. p. 300.
 xiv. 22. p. 310.
 25, 28. p. 300.
 xv. 16. p. 309.
 19, 20. p. 310.
 29. p. 312.
 30. p. 313.
 xvi. 5, 6. p. 310.
 7, 8, 9. p. 311, 312.
 xvii. 3—6. p. 313.
 3—22. p. 383.
 4. p. 318.
 24. p. 314.
 24, 31. p. 211, 303.
 xviii. 3—6. p. 319.
 7. p. 312.
 7, 8. p. 317.

2 Kings.

INDEX of Texts of Scripture.

2 Kings.

- Ch. xviii. 9, 10, 11. p. 313.
 13—16. p. 318.
 15, 16. p. 328.
 17, 19. p. 321.
 37. p. 322.
 xix. 1—4, 6—13. p. 322.
 12. p. 309.
 20, 28, 29, 32—35. p. 323.
 36, 37. p. 282.
 37. p. 257, 325, 329.
 xx. 1—7. p. 319.
 8—11. p. 320.
 12. p. 319, 347.
 12, 13. p. 328.
 17. p. 361.
 17, 18. p. 372.
 xxiii. 29. p. 344.
 31. p. 373.
 31, 33. p. 345.
 xxiv. 1. p. 258.
 7. p. 345, 355, 358, 359.
 10, 11, 12, 14, 16. p. 360.
 11. p. 356, 357.
 13, 17. p. 361.
 18. p. 373.
 20. p. 368.
 xxv. 1—22. p. 372.
 27. p. 357.
 27—30. p. 399.
 29, 30. p. 401.

1 Chron.

- Ch. ii. 11, 12. p. 171.
 iii. 15. p. 373.
 v. 6, 26. p. 312.
 vi. 4—8, 50, 53. p. 173.
 4—15. p. 175.
 viii. 1, 2, 3. p. 419.
 33. p. 144.
 x. 10. p. 209.
 xi. 1—8. p. 120.
 xiii. 5. p. 459.
 xiv. 1. p. 467.
 xviii. 1—13. p. 290.

1 Chron.

- Ch. xviii. 3—8. p. 296.
 3, 9. p. 288.
 xix. 16, 18, 19. p. 291.
 xx. 1, 2, 3. p. 293.
 4. p. 297.
 xxi. 5. p. 115.
 xxix. 7. p. 420.

2 Chron.

 Ch. iii. 2. p. 145.
 vii. 8. p. 458, 459.
 viii. 1. p. 167.
 3, 4. p. 288.
 ix. 26. p. 275.
 xii. 13. p. 292.
 xiii. 7. p. 293.
 xvi. 1. p. 298.
 1—6. p. 299.
 14. p. 373.
 xxi. 19. p. 373.
 xxvi. 10. p. 225.
 xxviii. 5—8, 11, 15, 17, 18. p. 310.
 20. p. 312.
 xxxii. 2—9. p. 321.
 21. p. 323, 324.
 23, 27. p. 328.
 31. p. 319.
 xxxiii. 11. p. 330.
 11, 13—18. p. 331.
 xxxiv. 3, etc. p. 356.
 xxxv. 20. p. 344.
 xxxvi. 2, 3, 4. p. 345.
 6, 7. p. 359.
 9, 10. p. 360.
 12, 13. p. 368.
 13. p. 361.
 13—22. p. 372.
 17. p. 371.
 18. p. 372.
 20. p. 418.
 21. p. 374.

Ezra.

- Ch. i. 1, 2, 3. p. 430.

Ezra.

INDEX of Texts of Scripture.

Ezra.

- Ch. ii. 69. p. 420.
iv. 2. p. 314, 316.
9, 10. p. 314.
vi. 22. p. 348.
vii. 1, 2, 3. p. 174.
2—5. p. 173.
viii. 27. p. 420.

Neh.

- Ch. viii. 14. p. 28.

Esth.

- Ch. i. 1. p. 415, 416.
ii. 16. p. 28.
iii. 7. p. 28.

Job.

- Ch. i. 6. p. 9.
xiii. 9. p. 367.
xxxviii. 7. p. 9.

Psalms.

- xxxiii. 7. p. 4.
lxxiv. 13, 14. p. 370.
lxxxii. 5. p. 227.
xc. 4. p. 97.
civ. 7, 8. p. 4.
cxiv. 1. p. 227.
cxxxvii. 7. p. 375.

Isaiah.

- Ch. vii. 8. p. 315, 316.
viii. 4. p. 312.
x. 9. p. 230, 345.
24, 25. p. 324.
xi. 11. p. 223.
xiii. 17. p. 429.
xiv. 1, 2, 3. p. 430.
22. p. 409, 418.
24, 25. p. 324.
xx. 1. p. 318.
3, 4. p. 330.
xxi. 2, etc. p. 364, 429.
xxiii. 12, 15—18. p. 377.

Isaiah.

- Ch. xxiii. 15. p. 350.
xxvii. 12. p. 456, 458.
xxx. 1. p. 328.
xxxvi. 4, 5, 29, 30, 31. p. 321.
xxxvii. 8—14. p. 322.
12. p. 269.
19. p. 322.
21, 29, 30, 33—36. p. 323.
38. p. 329.
xxxviii. 7, 8. p. 320.
xxxix. 1. p. 347.
6. p. 361.
xliv. 28. p. 430.
xlvi. 1. p. 236.
xlvii. 5. p. 362.
li. 6, 8, 9. p. 370.
lv. ult. p. 225.
lvi. 5. p. 225.

Jerem.

- Ch. ii. 18. p. 459.
xxii. 11. p. 373.
18. p. 374.
18, 19. p. 359.
xxv. 1, 9, 11, 12, 15—27, 29.
p. 362.
12. p. 430.
25, 26. p. 412.
xxvii. 1. p. 366.
1—8. p. 375.
2, 3. p. 162, 367.
1, 3, 12, 20. p. 366.
6, 7. p. 367.
7. p. 410, 418.
9, 14. p. 367.
9, 10, 11. p. 368.
12. p. 366.
12—17. p. 368.
18—22. p. 372.
20. p. 366.
xxviii. 1. p. 366.
1—4, 12—18. p. 368.
xxix. 10. p. 430.
xxxii. 4. p. 372.

Jerem.

INDEX of Texts of Scripture.

Jerem.

- Ch. xxxii. 9. p. 115.
 xxxiv. 3. p. 372.
 4, 5. p. 373.
 7. p. 370.
 8—14. p. 327.
 8—18. p. 372.
 9. p. 367.
 xxxv. 11. p. 355.
 xxxvi. 30. p. 359.
 xxxvii. 5, 7—10. p. 371.
 xxxix. 1—10. p. 372.
 xl. 14. p. 375.
 xlii. 16, 17. p. 387.
 xliii. 8—13. p. 387.
 xliv. 1, 27, 28. p. 388.
 27—30. p. 387.
 30. p. 391.
 xlvi. 2, 9, 10. p. 355.
 13. p. 362.
 13—26. p. 387.
 25, 26. p. 391.
 xlvii. 48—51. p. 362.
 xlix. 1—34. p. 375.
 34. p. 363.
 l. 2. p. 236.
 17, 18. p. 347.
 38. p. 429.
 li. 27. p. 427.
 27, 28. p. 429.
 31, 32. p. 428.
 39, 57, 58. p. 429.
 lii. 4—28. p. 372.
 28. p. 356, 359, 360.
 30. p. 376.
 31—34. p. 399.

Ezekiel.

- Ch. i. 1, 2. p. 361.
 iv. 1, etc. p. 218.
 4, 5, 6. p. 383.
 6. p. 385.
 viii. 1. p. 361.
 xii. 13. p. 372.
 xvii. 12—15. p. 361.
 15, 17. p. 368.
 xx. 1. p. 361.

Ezekiel.

- Ch. xxi. 19—22. p. 369.
 xxiii. 22. p. 370.
 xxv. 1—10, etc. p. 375.
 xxvi. 14, 21. p. 377.
 xxviii. 1—10. p. 376.
 xxix. 1, 17. p. 361.
 1, 2. p. 388.
 3. p. 370.
 6—12. p. 371.
 10, 11, 12, 14, 15. p. 387.
 17. p. 376.
 17—20. p. 388.
 18, 19, 20. p. 382.
 30, 31, 32. p. 387.
 xxx. 5, 13—18. p. 387, 388.
 20—26. p. 388.
 xxxi. 1. p. 361.
 xxxii. 22. p. 347, 362, 354.
 24. p. 354, 363.
 24—30. p. 363.
 26. p. 347, 354, 362.
 31, 32. p. 363.
 32. p. 391.
 xxxiii. 21. p. 361.
 xl. 1. p. 361.

Dan.

- Ch. i. 2. p. 223.
 3—7. p. 375.
 5, 18. p. 394.
 ii. 13, 17. p. 395.
 31, 32, 33, 37, 38. p. 393.
 39. p. 394.
 41. p. 393.
 iii. 12, 14, 18. p. 395.
 iv. 16, 23, 25, 30, 32. p. 396.
 30. p. 276.
 32, 33. p. 397.
 34—37. p. 398.
 v. 13, 14. p. 365.
 28. p. 410.
 29. p. 421.
 31. p. 338.
 vi. 1. p. 338.
 1, 2, 8, 12, 15. p. 415.
 vii. 25. p. 397.

Dan

INDEX of Texts of Scripture.

Dan.

- Ch. viii. 2. p. 269, 363.
 27. p. 365.
 ix. 1. p. 343, 416.
 24. p. 454.
 x. 1, 12, 21. p. 9.
 xi. 13. p. 397.
 xii. 7. p. 397.

Hosea.

- Ch. i. 6, 7. p. 323.
 v. 13. p. 309, 311, 312.
 x. 5, 6, 7. p. 314.

Amos.

- Ch. i. 4, 5. p. 312.
 9—15. p. 375.
 ii. 1, 2, 3. p. 375.
 iii. 14. p. 314.
 v. 5, 6. p. 314.
 vi. 2. p. 288.

Obad.

- 10—16. p. 375.

Jonah.

- Ch. iii. 4—10. p. 306.

Micah.

- Ch. i. 7. p. 314.
 v. 6. p. 231.

Nahum.

- Ch. i, ii, iii. p. 307.
 ii. 8, 9, 10. p. 348.
 iii. 8, 9, 10. p. 387, 389.

Zeph.

- Ch. ii. 13, 14, 15. p. 307, 348.

Zech.

- Ch. i. 7. p. 28.
 v. 11. p. 223.
 vii. 1. p. 28.
 xi. 12. p. 115.
 Vol. I.

I Esdras.

- Ch. i. 40, 41. p. 359.
 44, 45. p. 360.
 48. p. 361.
 53. p. 371.
 54. p. 372.
 iii. 2. p. 415.
 viii. 1, 2. p. 174.
 2. p. 173.

Tobit.

- Ch. i. 13. p. 312.
 15. p. 318.
 17—22. p. 324.
 21. p. 325, 329.
 ii. 1. p. 324.
 xiv. 2, 4. p. 346.
 5. p. 343.
 10, 11, 12, 15. p. 346.
 15. p. 416.

Judith.

- Ch. i. 1. p. 256, 283, 307.
 2, 3, 4. p. 336.
 5. p. 283.
 6. p. 338.
 6—10. p. 332, 333.
 7—13. p. 334.
 15. p. 283.
 15, 16. p. 334.
 ii. 1, 5. p. 334.
 7. p. 339.
 15. p. 334.
 iii. 8. p. 395.
 iv. 2, 3, 6. p. 336.
 7. p. 337.
 v. 18. p. 336.
 vi. 2. p. 395.
 xvi. 10. p. 338.
 23, 25. p. 337.

Ecclus.

- Ch. xvii. 17. p. 9.
 xlv. 16. p. 62.

R r r

Baruch,

INDEX of Texts of Scripture.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;">Baruch.</p> <p>Ch. i. 11. p. 419.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Bel and Drag.</p> <p>1. p. 411.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1 Maccab.</p> <p>Ch. i. 10. p. 115.
 x. 31. p. 114.
 83, 84. p. 209.
 xiii. 41, 42. p. 115.
 51. p. 116, 117.
 xv. 6, 7. p. 115.
 6, 10. p. 114.
 xvi. 16. p. 117.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2 Maccab.</p> <p>Ch. ii. 5. p. 359.
 xv. 36. p. 28.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Matt.</p> <p>Ch. i. 5, 6. p. 171.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Luke.</p> <p>Ch. iii. 31, 32. p. 171.
 36. p. 74.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Acts.</p> <p>Ch. vii. 4. p. 100, 102.
 xiii. 17—21. p. 167.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Acts.</p> <p>Ch. xiii. 20, 21. p. 141, 152.
 23. p. 169.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2 Cor.</p> <p>Ch. iv. 6. p. 3.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heb.</p> <p>Ch. ii. 14. p. 32.
 vii. 4. p. 270.
 xi. 4. p. 33.
 31. p. 173.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1 Pet.</p> <p>Ch. i. 19, 20. p. 32.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2 Pet.</p> <p>Ch. ii. 4. p. 59.
 iii. 8. p. 98.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1 John.</p> <p>Ch. iii. 12. p. 33.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Jude.</p> <p>14. p. 59.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Revelat.</p> <p>Ch. xii. 7. p. 9.
 9. p. 32.
 xiii. 8. p. 32, 33.
 xx. 2. p. 32.</p> |
|--|---|

An INDEX of the PRINCIPAL MATTERS contained in the First Volume.

A.

ABEL born in the Year before *Christ* 5411, p. 30. His Offerings accepted: slain by his Brother *Cain*, and his Body buried in the Ground, p. 32. The ancient *Jews* thought *Abel* was slain in the 99th Year of the World, p. 65.

Abraham, esteemed a righteous Man, and skilled in celestial Science, by the ancient *Chaldeans*, p. 77, and p. 221: born in the Year before *Christ* 2097, p. 127: the first Reformer of Religion after it was corrupted with Idolatry; and Teacher of the Worship of the one true God, p. 126, 127. *Abraham* defeated the four confederate Kings, in the Year before *Christ* 2018, p. 192, and 271.

Adam, God revealed to him the History of the Creation, and his own and *Eve's* Formation, p. 1. The History of the Creation explained, p. 2—12. *Adam* inspired with Language, p. 21. *Adam* and *Eve* created about the Middle of *March*, in the Year 5426 before the vulgar *Christian* Æra; and lived together in Paradise seven Years, p. 30.

Aera of *Nabonassar* explained at large, p. 434—456. Some Errors of *Ptolemy* observed in the *Augustan* Æra, p. 450, 451. Æra of the *Median* Kingdom fixed by an Eclipse, p. 350—353.

Annual Motion of the Earth began on the fourth Day of the Creation, p. 4, 5.

Angels, an Account of them, p. 8, 9, 10.

Antediluvians, long Lives of them, p. 30, 31.

Ark of *Noah*, where it rested, p. 47, 223.

Aquila of *Pontus* translated the *Hebrew* Bible into *Greek*, A. D. 128. and corrupted several Texts, p. 93, 94.

Amos began to prophecy in the Year before *Christ* 785, p. 315.

Asbur went from the Land of *Shinar*, and built *Nineveh*, p. 230, 231, 232. See *Nineveh*.

Arabian Kings, Dynasty of six commenced in the Year before *Christ* 2448, p. 235.

Assyrians assisted the *Trojans* in the War with the *Greeks*, p. 243, 244.

Assyrian Empire continued something more than 1300 Years, from *Ninus*, p. 244, 245, 246. Errors of *Ctesias* and modern Chronologers concerning the Fall of it shewn, p. 300—309. A Catalogue of thirty-six *Assyrian* Kings from *Ctesias*, with their Times, p. 247—253. Another Catalogue of the thirty-six *Assyrian* Kings in their true Times, p. 276—280.

Asar-Adon, King of *Assyria*, recovered *Babylon* in the Year before *Christ* 680, p. 329, 330. He invaded *Arabia* and *Egypt*, and ravaged them with his Armies for three Years together. And in the Year 677 before *Christ*, he invaded the Kingdom of *Judah*, and took *Manasses* Prisoner, and carried him Captive to *Babylon*, p. 330, 331.

Attica, called at first *Acte*, and why, p. 239, and Note 94.

B.

Babel, the building of the Tower
R r r 2 and

INDEX of Principal Matters.

and the Overthrow of it; and the Confusion of Languages mentioned in the *Sibylline* Writings, p. 228. The first *Babylonian* Gods and their Times, p. 236, 237.

Babylon, *Belus* began to reign there in the Year before *Christ* 2233, p. 237. See the Account of him, p. 238—247. Astronomical Observations made at *Babylon*, in the Year before *Christ* 2233, p. 242. The second *Babylonian* Dynasty of five Kings beginning with *Belus*, p. 267, 268. The *Babylonian* Kingdom was divided from the *Assyrian* Empire upon the Destruction of *Nineveh*, in the Year before *Christ* 606. The first King was *Nabopolassar*, the Father of *Nabuchadnezzar*, p. 349. *Babylon* taken by Surprise at the Time of a public Festival, by *Cyrus*, p. 427. Many Prophecies fulfilled by the taking of it, p. 428, 429.

Barabbas, the Jewish false *Christ* and Persecutor of the *Christians*, p. 94

Battle, the Battle between *Arphaxad*, or *Pbraortes* King of *Media*, and *Nabuchodonosor* King of *Assyria*, near *Ragau* (in which *Pbraortes* was taken and slain, and most of his Kingdom subdued) was in the Year before *Christ* 625, in *November* or *December*, 334, 335. *Usher*, *Petavius*, and *Prideaux*, mistaken, in supposing *Arphaxad* to be *Dejoces*, Father of *Pbraortes*, p. 335—337.

Beasts, clean and unclean, why, p. 31.

Belshazzar, his History enlarged on, and *Xenophon* shewn to be mistaken, p. 403 to 412.

Berosus, Priest of *Belus* at *Babylon*, wrote his *Chaldean* History in the Year before *Christ* 268, p. 196.

In it he gave an Account of the Creation, of the universal Deluge, and of some being saved in an Ark. The *Athenians* erected in their public School a Statue for him, with a Golden Tongue, p. 197.

Bitumen, an Account of it, p. 223.

C.

Cain, born in the Year before *Christ* 5418, p. 30. His Offerings rejected, and why, p. 33. He slew his Brother *Abel*, p. 32. He was banished with his Family, whither, p. 34. After his Banishment he is said to have prayed to the Sun, p. 34, 35.

Cainan, Son of *Arphaxad*, proved to have been in the Genealogy after the Flood, p. 69—81.

Chaldean Account of the Creation, p. 12, 13.

Chaldean Kings ten, who reigned before the Flood of *Noah*, from *Apollodorus*, *Abydenus*, and *Africanus*, out of the Annals of *Berosus*. This Kingdom commenced in the Year of the World 1073, and continued 1183 Years to the Flood, p. 198, 199. The large *Chaldean* Numbers, supposed to be Years, proved to be Days, and agreeable to other ancient Computations, p. 200, 201, and p. 216—220. *Chaldean* History of the Flood, from *Berosus*, shewn to be agreeable to the Account of *Moses*, p. 210—214. *Berosus* related the Deluge to begin in the second Month called *Desius*, answering to *April*; and the same Month in which *Moses* related it to begin, p. 210, 211.

Chaldeans and *Egyptians* first made Astronomical Observations, p. 220, 221,

INDEX of Principal Matters.

221, 222. Dynasty of *Chaldean* Kings after the Dispersion from *Babel*, p. 233, 234.

Ctesias, in great Repute in the *Persian* Court, p. 255. Extracted his History out of the Royal Records, *ibid.* His Mistake of the Commencement of the *Assyrian* and *Median* Empires, p. 255—258.

Chronology of Scripture, from the Creation to the *Christian* Æra shewn, p. 125, 126.

Cycle, Sabbatical and Jubilean Cycles began in the Year before *Christ* 1545, p. 134. The Cycle of nineteen Years formed by *Meton* and *Euctemon*, began in the Year before *Christ* 432; that of *Calippus* commenced in the Year before *Christ* 329, p. 440.

Cambyfes, the Time of his Reign, and of his Conquest of *Egypt* settled, p. 453, 454.

Captivity of the *Jews* for seventy Years commenced, in the Year before *Christ* 604, p. 355.

Carthage, the Æra of the building of it proved to be the Year before *Christ* 891, or 890, p. 470, 471. *Virgil* guilty of a great Anachronism about it, p. 472, Note 8.

Creation, God created all things out of nothing, Note 5, p. 7, 8. At what Season of the Year it commenced, p. 22—29.

Cynic Circle of the *Egyptian* *Mezrites*, commenced 553 Years after the Flood, and in the Year before *Christ* 2616, p. 215.

Cyaxares, Son of *Astyages*, mentioned by *Xenophon*, proved to be a fictitious King, p. 411, 412, 413.

Cyrus, he reigned in *Persia* in the Year before *Christ* 557: and seven Years after this, in the Year before

Christ 550, he conquered and deposed *Astyages* King of the *Medes*, p. 423. Four Years after this he conquered *Craesus*, in the Year before *Christ* 546, p. 425. After the Conquest of the *Medes*, several Nations of the upper and lower *Asia* refused to be tributary to *Cyrus*, which occasioned Wars for the Space of fourteen Years, which ended at the taking of *Babylon*, in the Year before *Christ* 536, p. 425 to 427. *Cyrus* published a Decree from *Ecbatana* for the Return of the *Jews*, in the Year before *Christ* 535, and the first Year of his Reign at *Babylon*, p. 430; and then the seventy Years Captivity of the *Jews* ended, p. *ibid.* and p. 431. The Errors of *Africanus*, *Eusebius*, and others, about the ending of the *Jewish* seventy Years Captivity, shewn p. 431, 432, 433.

D.

Dæmons and Heroes were worshiped, in the Sun, Moon, Stars, and Planets; and were taught to be eternal and supreme Gods, in *Phœnicia*, *Chaldaea*, and *Egypt*, p. 19, 20.

Damascus, this Kingdom set up by *Rezon*, in the latter End of the Reign of *David*, proved against *Usher*, p. 296—298.

Daniel, the seventh and eighth Chapters of his Prophecies belong not to the Reign of *Belshazzar*, but to the Reign of *Darius* the *Mede*, p. 365, 366. His Prophecies concerning *Nabuchadnezzar* explained, p. 393—398: and the Times of other Prophecies shewn, p. 422.

Daniel's Prophecy of seventy Weeks shewn to be fulfilled at the Baptism of *Christ*, p. 454, Note 27.

Dispersion

I N D E X of Principal Matters.

Dispersion of the Descendants of *Noah* happened 531 Years after the Flood, and in the Year before *Christ* 2638, p. 66. See the Table there.

Darius the *Mede* proved to be *Astyages*, p. 413—424. *Darius* a common Name of the *Median* Kings, p. 419, 420.

Darics, an ancient *Assyrian* or *Babylonian* Coin, explained, p. 420.

David, he conquered the *Jebusites*, and took the Fort of *Mount Sion* from them, in the Year before *Christ* 1049; and about the Year 1047 he beat *Hadad-Ezer* King of *Zobab*, and subdued the *Syrians* of *Damascus* his Allies, p. 289; and made them tributary, p. 290. A Year after this, in the Year before *Christ* 1046, *David* subdued the *Moabites*, *Edomites*, *Ammonites*, *Philistines*, and *Amalekites*: and by these Conquests fulfilled several Prophecies, p. 290. In the Year before *Christ* 1039, *David* made War upon *Hanun* King of the *Ammonites*, and beat the *Ammonites* and *Syrians* of *Zobab*; and in the same Year totally defeated *Hadar-Ezer*, and the *Mesopotamian Syrians*, who all made Peace with *David* and became tributary to him, p. 290, 291. These Conquests put an End to the powerful *Syrian* Kingdom of *Zobab*, p. 292. In the Year before *Christ* 1038, *David* took *Rabbab* by Storm, which was the royal City of the *Ammonites*, and put the *Ammonites* every where to Death in the most cruel Manner, p. 292, 293. The Weight of *Hanun's* Crown, being a Talent of Gold, explained; and also the *Greek* Talent. During the Siege of *Rabbab*, *David* committed Adultery with *Bathsbeba*, *Uriah's*

Wife, and caused him to be murdered, p. 292, 293, 294. The Wars of *David* ended in the Year before *Christ* 1037; and his and *Saul's* Conquests are summed up, p. 292—294. *Ussher's* Mistakes about *David's* Conquests shewn, p. 296, 297.

Divination by Arrows explained, p. 368, 369.

Drought in *Abab's* Reign, mentioned by *Menander* in his *Tyrian Annals*, p. 191.

E.

Ecbatana, the capital City of *Media*, built by *Dejoces* the first King, about the Year before *Christ* 691, p. 307.

Eden, the Garden, where situated, p. 20.

Egyptian Account of the Cosmogony, p. 17; and of other ancient Nations, p. *ibid.* and p. 18. The River of *Egypt* explained, and proved to be the *Nile*, p. 456—460.

Egregori, see an Account of them under the Word *Setb*.

Enoch, the Age of the Book ascribed to him, p. 59, 60.

Ephraim, the ten Tribes of *Israel* so called, and why, p. 309.

Ezekiel, *Daniel*, and others of the Seed Royal carried Captives to *Babylon*, in the Year before *Christ* 597, p. 360, 361. *Ezech.* ch. i. 1. explained, p. 361. Note 18.

Eve, more rightly called *Heve*, lived seven Years with *Adam* in *Paradise* before her Fall, p. 22.

F.

Flood of *Noah*, an Account of it, p. 46—50. began in the Spring, on the sixth Day of *May*, in the Year of

I N D E X of Principal Matters.

of the World 2256: and in the Year before *Christ* 3170. The *Chaldean* History of *Berosus*, from the *Babylonian* Annals, placed it in the same Month in which *Moses* relates it, p. 210, 211.

G.

Genealogy, from *Adam* to the Flood, which is proved to have been in the Year of the World 2256, p. 36—46. From the Flood to *Abraham*, who was born 1072 Years after it; this *Genealogy* proved, p. 66—87. *Genealogy* of the Patriarchs from *Abraham* to *Moses*, with their several Ages, p. 127—133. *Genealogy* from *Naashon* to *Solomon* reconciled to the Term of 579 Years, from the Exodus of the *Israelites* from *Egypt* to the Foundation of the Temple, p. 172—175. *Genealogy* of the Kings of *Israel* and *Judah*, from the Foundation of *Solomon's* Temple to the burning of the City of *Jerusalem*, and the Temple by *Nabuchadnezzar*, p. 176—194. The Method of the *Jewish* reckoning of the Reigns of those Kings, p. 193, 194. *Genealogy* of *Babylonian* Kings from *Abydenus*, and of contemporary *Armenian* Kings from *Maribas* and *Abydenus*, with the History of them, p. 263—267.

Grandsons, called Sons in Scripture, p. 419, Note 34.

H.

Hadad and *Adar*, and *Azar* and *Ezer* explained, p. 289, Note 2.

Hebrew and *Samaritan* Copies corrupted, in the Chronological Numbers, p. 50—58, and p. 66—67.

Hiram or *Hiram*, Son of *Abibalus* and King of old *Tyre*. The

Years of his Reign shewn to be fifty-three, from the Scripture and *Josephus*, p. 467, 468.

Hoseab, he began to prophecy about the Year before *Christ* 785, p. 315.

J.

Jerusalem, the City and Temple burnt by *Nabuchadnezzar*, in the Year before *Christ* 586, which was a sabbatical Year, p. 372, 373.

Jews, the Reason of their altering the Chronology of Scripture, p. 96—100: changed their ancient *Mosaic* Letters for the *Chaldean* or *Assyrian*, in the second Century of the *Christian* Æra, p. 108, and 109—119. They imposed upon *Eusebius*, in the Computation of the Times of the Judges, p. 163. Their seventy Years Captivity, in the Country of *Babylon*, ended in the second Year of *Cyrus* (or the first) in the Year before *Christ* 535, proved, p. 378—382. *Joseph Scaliger*, *Petavius*, *Usher*, *Sir I. Newton*, all mistaken about it, p. 379, 380.

Jonah, he prophesied against *Nineveh* about the Year before *Christ* 800, p. 305.

Josephus, a full Account of his Chronology of the Scripture; and that many of his Numbers have been altered, shewn p. 119—127.

Joshua, the Time of his Government of the *Israelites* after the Death of *Moses* shewn, p. 134, 135.

Josiah, slain in Battle at *Megiddo*, in the Year before *Christ* 608, p. 344, 345.

Judges, the Years of the several Judges of the *Israelites* after *Moses*, according to various Computations, p. 145 to 162.

Judith,

INDEX of Principal Matters.

Judith, her History mistaken by Chronologers; and the true Time of it shewn, p. 337—339.

K.

1 K. ch. vi. 1. proved to be interpolated by the *Jews*, p. 146—148. The interpolated Words not in *Origen's* Copies *Hebrew* or *Greek*, p. 164, 165. Error of *Ussher*, *Scaliger*, and *Petavius*, concerning them, p. 166, 167, 168: and farther Proof of the Interpolation, *ibid.* An Error of *Ussher*, p. 169, 170.

Kings, Assyrian, Babylonian, Median, Egyptian, and Persian, had two Names, p. 254.

L.

Letus the *Phœnician* Historian, and *Menander* of *Pergamus*, who wrote the *Tyrian Annals*, both misunderstood by *Tatian* and *Clemens Alexandrinus*, about the Time of *Solomon*, p. 155, 156.

Lydian War between *Halyattes* and *Cyaxares*, which lasted five Years, and ended by means of a total Eclipse of the Sun, foretold by *Thales*, which happened in the middle of a Battle, commenced in the Year before *Christ* 591; and the Eclipse was in the Year 586, p. 350—353.

M.

Madys, a *Scythian* King, invaded and conquered the upper *Asia*, in the Year before *Christ* 624. The *Scythians* reigned there twenty-eight Years, and were driven out by *Cyaxares* King of *Media*, in the Year before *Christ* 596, p. 340, 341.

Media, Catalogue of the Kings

from *Ctesias*, p. 253, 254, 280; and the true *Æra* of the *Median* Kingdom shewn, p. 280. The *Ctesian* Account of the *Assyrian* and *Median* Kingdoms corrected by the Scripture-History, p. 281—285. *Medes* and other Provinces revolted from the *Assyrians*, in the Year before *Christ* 711, p. 329.

Melchisedec, he was King of *Salem* in the Year before *Christ* 2015. He built or enlarged *Solyra* or *Salem*, about the Year before *Christ* 2018, p. 192.

Memnonia, a Palace, etc. built by *Memnon* Son of *Tithonus*, p. 251, 252. Note 25.

Months, Names of *Hebrew* Months, p. 28.

Mosaic History of the Creation, pretended to be derived from the *Egyptians*, p. 20.

Moses, he led the Children of *Israel* out of *Egypt* when he was eighty Years of Age, in the Year before *Christ* 1593, and 430 Years after *Abraham* came into the Land of *Canaan*, which was in the Year before *Christ* 2023, p. 132.

Mysteries, secret Doctrines taught in them, p. 20.

N.

Nabonassar *Æra* largely treated of and explained, p. 434—456.

Nabuchadnezzar, his Conquests and the Epochs of them shewn at large, p. 354—391.

Nabum, the Prophet, foretold the Destruction of *Nineveh*, about the Year before *Christ* 745 or 750, p. 307, 348.

Nerus, a Number of 600 Days, and the sixth Part of a *Sarus*, or ten old

INDEX of Principal Matters.

old *Chaldean* Years, each of 360 Days, p. 200.

Nimrod, Promoter of the building of *Babel*. He built several Cities, described p. 229, 230. He began to reign at *Babel* in the Year before *Christ* 2638, p. 233.

Nineveh, built by *Asbur*, soon after the Dispersion, *Gen.* ch. x. 11. that Text explained, and *Bochart*, *Hyde*, etc. shewn to be mistaken, p. 230—232. A Description of *Nineveh* in the Reign of *Ninus*, p. 276. Note 70. *Nineveh* taken by the *Medes* and *Babylonians*, and thereby an End put to the *Assyrian* Empire, which was divided between them, in the Year before *Christ* 606, p. 342—349.

Ninus, Son of the *Assyrian Belus*, and not of the *Babylonian*, began to reign in the Year before *Christ* 2016, from this Year the *Assyrian* Empire commenced, p. 258—261. also p. 264. He first set up Idolatry in *Assyria*; and ordered his Father to be worshiped as the *Assyrian Bel*, or *Belus*, p. 261.

O.

Oannes, the *Babylonian* Fish-God, the same as *Dagon*. An Account of him, p. 209, 210.

Origen, the Design and Use of his Obelisks and Asterisks, p. 95.

Oracle of *Apollo*, confessed that the *Chaldeans* and *Hebrews* had the true Knowledge of God, p. 20.

Orphic Account of the Creation, p. 15, 16.

P.

Period, from the *Israelites* going out of *Egypt* to the Foundation of *Solomon's* Temple, largely treated
VOL. I.

of, and shewn to be 579 Years, p. 133—145. The Series of Years of that Period summed, p. 137, 138, to p. 145.

Phœnician Account of the Creation, p. 13, 14, 15.

Posideon, an *Attic* Month, *December*, first and second *Posideon*, p. 24.

Prophecy of *Ezekiel*, ch. iv. 4, 5. explained, p. 383—385. *Prophecy* of *6* cannot be explained by the Author of these Volumes, p. 385, 386.

Pul, first King of *Assyria*, mentioned in Scripture. He conquered the *Syrian* Kingdoms of *Mesopotamia*. In the Year before *Christ* 770 he passed the *Tigris* and *Euphrates*, and came with a great Army through *Syria* into the Land of *Israel*, to deliver the *Israelites* from the Tyranny of *Menabem*: but *Menabem* bought him off with a great Sum of Money, with which he engaged him on his Side, p. 309.

S.

Sabbath, instituted by God, observed by the religious Worshipers of God before the Flood; and after the Flood, by the Patriarchs and by the *Israelites* before the Law of *Moses*. Hence came the reckoning by Weeks: and the seventh Day was accounted sacred every where, p. 21. Note 32.

Sacea, a *Babylonian* Festival of five Days: at which Time *Cyrus* took *Babylon*, p. 427, 428.

Sacrifices were appointed by God; and were typical of the propitiatory Sacrifice of *Christ's* Death, p. 31, 32.

Samaritan Hebrew Text and Letters discoursed of at large, p. 104—119.

S s s

Samuel,

INDEX of Principal Matters.

Samuel, his Age settled, p. 142, 143.

Salman-Afar, King of *Assyria*, invaded *Hoshea* King of *Israel*, and made him tributary. Afterward finding him treacherous, and that he paid not his annual Tribute, he besieged him in *Samaria* three Years; and in the End of the third Year he took the City, and carried *Hoshea* and his People, the Ten Tribes, captive into the Provinces of *Assyria* and *Media*: and hereby put an End to the Kingdom of *Israel*, in the Year before *Christ* 721; after it had stood 256 Years, p. 312, 313. *Salman-Afar* invaded the *Tyrians* of old *Tyre* without Success; and blocked up the City by Land five Years; and died in the Year before *Christ* 713 or 714, p. 316, 317.

Sardanapalus, an Account of him, p. 253. He was the Scripture *Ashur-Haddon*, p. 257. Two *Assyrian* Kings so called by the *Greeks*; and their different Times and Characters, p. 308, 309.

Saul, he began his Wars with the *Moabites*, *Ammonites*, *Edomites*, and the Kings of *Zobab*, in the Year before *Christ* 1075, p. 287. *Zobab* described, *ibid.* and p. 288.

Scaliger, his Difficulty about the Death of *Zedekiah*, *Jerem.* ch. xxxiv. 4, 5. cleared, p. 373, 374.

Sarus, Ten old *Chaldean* Years of 360 Days each, p. 200, 201. *A-Sassus* sixty Days, or the sixth Part of a *Chaldean* Year, p. 200.

Semiramis, she began to reign in the Year before *Christ* 1964. An Account of her and others of the Name, p. 276—278.

Senacherib, this King of *Assyria* made War upon *Hezekiah*, and in-

·vaded *Judea* with a prodigious Army, and took several fortified Cities of *Judab*; and was ready to besiege *Jerusalem* in the Year before *Christ* 713. *Hezekiah* being afraid of so great a Force, gave him all the Money he demanded: and he left *Judea* for a while, and marched his Army against the *Egyptians*. After this *Hezekiah* fell sick of the Plague, and upon his Prayer to God was cured by the Prophet *Isaiab*, who assured him from God, that he should reign fifteen Years longer, p. 318, 319: And gave him a Sign to satisfy him, by the Sun's Shadow going back ten Degrees on the Dial of *Abaz* explained, *ibid.* and p. 320. *Senacherib*, enraged at his ill Success against *Egypt*, and being forced to raise the Siege of *Pelusium*, broke his Agreement with *Hezekiah*, and sent three of his Generals with a great Army against *Jerusalem*, when he lost at *Libnab*, in one Night, one hundred eighty-five thousand of his Men, in the Year before *Christ* 712: upon this he fled to *Nineveh* with the Remains of his Army in great Confusion; and was soon after slain in the Temple of one of his Idols, by two of his Sons, in the Year before *Christ* 711, p. 320—324. The Deliverance of *Jerusalem* happened in a sabbatical Year, p. 325.

Septuagint, the Chronological Numbers of it in the Ages before the Flood proved to be right, p. 54—65: and after the Flood to *Abraham*, p. 66—91. The *Septuagint Greek* Version was approved and used by the ancient *Jews*, p. 72—74: commended by the *Babylonian* and *Jerusalem* Talmuds, p. 82, 83: who intimate, that the ancient

I N D E X of Principal Matters.

cient *Jews* found no Difference between the Septuagint Version and the *Hebrew* Text in the Chronological Numbers, from the Creation to *Abraham*, p. 82, 83. This Approbation farther confirmed, p. 91—94: not disused by the *Jews* till *Aquila* made a new *Greek* Translation from a corrupted *Hebrew* Copy, p. 93, 94. The Septuagint *Greek* Version was made in the Year before *Christ* 286. The History of it, p. 460—466.

Shekels, an Account of them: all inscribed with *Samaritan* Letters to the Time of the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, p. 113—119: first coined and inscribed in the Year before *Christ* 139 or 140, p. 114, 115.

Setb, his Descendants mixed and intermarried with the *Cainites*, and begat those called Giants, about the Year of the World 1070. These were the *Eggregori* so called: and a Tyranny was now set up by the *Cainites*, p. 60, 64: also p. 203, 204. *Tubal-Cain* the first antediluvian King, called *Al-Orus* by the *Chaldeans*, *Cbryfor* by the *Phœnicians*, *Hephestus* or *Vulcan* by the *Greeks* and *Latins*. He began to reign about the Year of the World 1070, p. 203, 204, 205, 208.

Sbinar, where situated, p. 223.

Solomon, his Age when he began to reign, p. 292, 293. Note 7.

Sophoniab, the Prophet, foretold the Destruction of *Nineveh*, about the Year before *Christ* 630, p. 307.

Symachus, he translated the *Hebrew* Bible into *Greek*, in the Year of *Christ* 200 or 201, p. 94.

Syrian Kingdoms of *Zobab* and *Damascus*, an Account of them, p. 285—295. *Syrians* and *Assyrians*

confounded by the Ancients, but distinguished in Scripture, p. 285—287.

T.

Temple of Solomon, founded in the Year before *Christ* 1014, p. 176. Burnt with the City by *Nabuchadnezzar*, in the Year before *Christ* 586, p. 189. It stood 428 Years, p. 192.

Terah, his Age treated of, p. 100—104.

Theodotion, he translated the *Hebrew* Bible into *Greek*, about the Year of *Christ* 185. His Version of the Book of *Daniel* was received by the *Christian* Church, p. 94, 95.

Titanian and Giant Wars commenced about the Year before *Christ* 2230, in the Reign of *Belus*, p. 240—242.

Tiglath-Pul-Asar, this King of *Assyria* helped *Abaz* against the confederate Kings of *Damascene* Syria and *Israel*, who had invaded him. He took *Damascus* and slew *Rezin* the King; and put an End to this Syrian Kingdom. Then he invaded the Country of the King of *Israel*; took many Cities of it, and carried the People away captive into *Assyria*. This was in the Years before *Christ* 740 and 739, p. 311, 312. By these Conquests several Prophecies were fulfilled, p. 312.

Tongues, Confusion of them at *Babel* into various Dialects and Languages, p. 226, 227.

Tower of Babel, an Account of it, and the Design of building it, p. 224, 225.

Tubal-Cain, first antediluvian King of *Babylonia*, p. 206, 207. He began to reign about the Year of the World

INDEX of Principal Matters.

World 1070, p. 63, 64.

Tuscan History of the Creation, p. 18.

Tyre, old *Tyre* besieged thirteen Years by *Nabuchadnezzar* before he took it, in the Year before *Christ* 571, p. 376, 377. Insular *Tyre* destroyed by *Alexander*, in the Year before *Christ* 332, p. 377. *Bocbart* mistaken. A Chronological Dissertation on the Kings of old *Tyre*, p. 466—471. An Account of the Kings of insular *Tyre*, p. 472, 473.

X.

Xerxes, the Epoch of his Reign

and of his Expedition into *Greece* treated of, and the *Parian* Marbles corrected, p. 445, 446: and Additions at the End of the Volume.

Y.

Years, the Sabbatical, and Years of Jubilee, p. 325. The Length of Year reckoned variously by the ancient Astronomers, p. 440, 441.

Z.

Zobah, a powerful Kingdom of *Syria*, described, p. 287, 288.

